NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

10c

Royal Oak, Michigan | December 1, 1941 | Subscription Three Dollars Per Year

AMERICA AGAINST AID TO U.S.S.R.!

(Read Page 3)

Speaking of Maps, How About Stalin's? That's Secret, Too!

(See Story on Page 8)

C.I.O. Convention Backs Both Lewis and F.D.R.

(Story on Page 7)

Catholic Bishops See 'Crisis of Christianity'

COMMENT ON WORLD EVENTS ★ READ: FR. COUGHLIN AND THE 'TIDINGS' ★ ANOTHER $7-BILLION FOR 'DEFENSE'

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dinner Chat

Is Our Country Christian?

THE *Ave Maria* notes that the *Fort Wayne News-Sentinel* "declares that if a heathen country is one in which most of the inhabitants are not baptized or are not members of any church, the United States can be so classified.

"Only 49 per cent of our population have affiliation, with any of the 250 religious denominations listed in the *Year Book of American Churches*. In other words, the church members in this country are now in a minority.

"Although there has been an increase in the number of denominations, a smaller per cent of our population are connected with any church. At the present time there are 64,501,594 church members in the United States with Catholics numbering 21,284,455 and Protestants numbering 36,103,984. Among the Protestant churches the Methodists come first with 7,377,487. The Northern and Southern Baptist churches are next with a total of 4,949,174. Other church membership includes Jewish 4,641,184, and Eastern Orthodox 735,440.

" 'Whether persons affiliated with churches comprise a majority or a minority,' says the *News-Sentinel*, 'may some day be very important if the popularization of the public opinion survey method is extended into government without constitutional protection of minority rights.

"Would the non-church affiliated 51 per cent of the American people even approve the need for churches?

"Would they approve or disapprove of the Bible as the word of God? They possibly would not.

"Will the freedom to worship as one pleases be enthusiastically defended if a majority of Americans profess, by their actions, that they see no need for worship? It will be interesting to see!"

'Pope LaGuardia I'

FOLLOWING his recent re-election, Mayor LaGuardia, of New York, entertained himself with an excursion into sermon writing.

In his capacity of chief of the Office of Civilian Defense he not only asked the clergy to stress the relationship between religion and "defense," but told them how to do it.

Imagine the little filthy-tongued Mayor of New York writing sermons for Christian pulpits!

Imagine the righteous anger which burned in the hearts of those ministers of the gospel who resent Caesar's dictating to God.

Of course, Bishop Wm. T. Manning—disciple of the Prince of War—okayed "Pope LaGuardia's" remarks.

Dr. John Haynes Holmes, however, said: "When I have to go to Washington for my sermons I will resign my pulpit and thus at least preserve my self-respect!"

The Rev. Doctor added: "In Russia, the government suppresses churches. In Germany, the government regiments them. In this country, the government is evidently preparing to follow the German example, for what is a request today will swiftly and surely become a command tomorrow."

"Pope LaGuardia" lacks *technique*.

If he had any diplomacy in his make-up he would have approached certain members of the hierarchy to persuade them to instruct their clergy to do the job.

That is the way Henry VIII operated. And he got by with it.

Testimonial Dinner

ON NOVEMBER 5th, in the Hotel Garde, New Haven, Connecticut, the American League for Christian Justice held its third annual celebration in honor of Father Coughlin's birthday. A crowd that packed the ballroom took part in the testimonial dinner, the solemnity and dignity of which pleased the local clergy who were guests.

The testimonial dinner has since been the "talk of the town." It was well past midnight when the singing of the *"Star Spangled Banner"* brought the festivities to a close and those present surged forward to congratulate the committee in charge.

It was, says a New Haven correspondent, "an outpouring of men and women from every walk of life who had assembled to thank publicly their great national teacher, the Royal Oak pastor, for his 15-year crusade in the cause of Christian social justice.

"We were proud to honor the patriot priest who had taught us to know and understand the mechanics of government and our own responsibilities as good citizens. We were proud to be counted as students or graduates of his 'national university' of the Golden Hour of the Little Flower.

"These plain people were proud that Father Coughlin had aroused in them sufficient Americanism to offset and overcome any *blitz* of war-mongering hysteria."

Father Affleck, O.P., pastor of St. Mary's church, gave a talk which pointed out the priest's humility and obedience to his superiors and his true greatness in that he "never lost sight of his ideal while working for an idea."

Father Edward Shea, pastor of St. Bernadette's church, discussed "Justice and Reconstruction of the Social Order."

Mr. John J. Henihan, Jr., of New York, spoke on the dignity and responsibility of a priestly priest.

This Is Your Last Chance For Christmas Subscription

HELLO FOLKS:

How are y' all this fine, brisk December th' first? All hale 'n harty, I hope. I'm pleezed t' report that not only I, but all my girul frien's in th' offus are in th' pink of helth. So's Deadline Daddy, if high coler meens enything. Y' know, haf th' fun uv livin' f'r me is gettin' that man 'cited 'bout whether 'r not I'm gonna prodoose th' goods, so t' speek. I don't know why he keeps on worryin'—I always show up. Sometimes not enny too erly in th' day, I know, but—better late than never, I say.

Well, I'm happy t' report that things 're goin' well at th' offus. All th' holadays 're outta th' way f'r twenty-four days ennyway, 'n we're all in th' groove, as they say. 'N y're in th' groove, to, judgin' from the subskripshuns're comin' in. A lot uv y' took my hint, too, I see 'n 're doin' y'r Chrismus shoppin' erly enuf t' 'void th' rush. That's fine. 'N there's still plenty uv time f'r those uv you who've not sent in those subskripshuns yet that y' plan to give y'r frien's f'r a token uv y'r esteem. Don't put it off enny longer, though, 'cause between th' handlin' uv th' subskripshuns here at this offus 'n gettin' th' names down t' th' printer, whose place uv biznuss is way off in Chicago, three weeks time 's needed.

I know this seems an awful long time t' put through subs, but some magazeens take even longer. We'd speed it up if we could, y' c'n bet y'r hat on that, but we jus' can't do it nohow. That's why I've been ergin' y' to get 'em in here erly. I know I've kinda been harpin' on that subjekt f'r a long time now—but I notus th' advertisers uv all th' magazeens, soaps, toothpaste, gasaleens 'n what have you all do th' same thing, so I guess it pays. I'll stop pretty soon, though, I promuse — Chrismus Eve, ennyway.

' ' '

Well, I haven't much news t' report. We had all our 'citement round Thanksgivin' time. Fether parties, 'n all that sort uv thing. They had a grand party up at th' new Shrine awditorium so I hear. Pal's Boss sorta took things over in th' line uv callin' out th' numbers 'n even though th' loud speekin' apparatus went on th' hummer f'r him, he manuged t' be herd all over th' place. Everyone had a lotta fun 'n prakticully everyone went home with a terkey 'r somethin' else.

' ' '

So now, w're sittin' waitin' f'r Santa Claus t' come. I'm bein' an awful good boy, too, 'cause I've got an awful long list uv things I'd like to have 'n I know I don't stand a chance at all if I don't behave myself. I'm bein' an old smoothie these days—so sweet I c'n hardly stand myself. I haven't written my letter to Santa yet, but I'm gonna take care uv that pretty soon. Nothin' like praktisin' what y' preech t' others, is there? I 'magin his offus mus' be pretty busy too, these days.

Well, I gotta get a move on. That five o'clock whissel is jus' 'bout due to blow 'n I don't wanna get killed in th' rush when all the pretty damsuls 'round here hurry out t' live th' other haf uv their lives.

See y' later, folks. Goodbye f'r now.

—Pete

16 PRINCIPLES OF SOCIAL JUSTICE

Liberty of conscience and education.
Just living annual wage.
Nationalization of important public resources.
Private ownership of all other property.
Control of private property for public good.
Abolition of Federal Reserve Banking System and establishment of a Government-owned Central Bank.
Restoration to Congress of its sole right to coin and regulate the value of money.
Cost of living maintained on an even keel.
Cost of production plus a fair profit for the farmer.
Labor's right to organize.
Recall of non-productive bonds.
Abolition of tax-exempt bonds.
Broadened base of taxation on basis of ownership and capacity to pay.
Simplification of Government and lower taxes.
Conscription of wealth as well as men in event of war.
Sanctity of human rights preferred to sanctity of property with Government's chief concern for the poor.

SOCIAL JUSTICE National Weekly, Copyrighted 1941 by the Social Justice Publishing Company, publication and editorial office, Royal Oak, Michigan. Subscription price, United States and possessions, $3.00 per year. Unless otherwise directed all subscriptions begin with the current issue. Three weeks are required to effect change of subscriber's address. Give both old and new addresses. Entered as second class matter, March 12, 1937, at the Post Office, Royal Oak, Michigan, under the Act of March 3, 1879. E. Perrin Schwartz, Editor; Cora Quinlan, Secretary-Treasurer.

SOCIAL JUSTICE is fully protected by copyright and nothing that appears in it may be reprinted either wholly or in part, without special permission. The use of articles or quotations from SOCIAL JUSTICE for digest, advertising, promotions and stock-selling schemes is never authorized.

Volume 8 December 1, 1941 No. 22

SUBSCRIPTION COUPON

Date_____

Name_____

Address_____ City_____

State_____ Subscription rate $3 a year. Renewal ☐ New ☐

SOCIAL JUSTICE PUBLISHING CO., Royal Oak, Michigan

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Our Stand on the 'All-Aid-to-Russia' (?) Program

IN THIS comment, we believe it is important to emphasize that we are speaking for ourselves only.

Plainly, and bluntly, we oppose and we will continue to oppose the so-called "aid-to-Russia" program.

We oppose it both on political and moral grounds.

We oppose it, no matter how many religionists or non-religionists support it, provided His Holiness, Pope Pius XII, does not make an explicit pronouncement bidding the Christian world to support it.

Let us rationalize our position:

We are aware that some lay persons and clergymen attempt to moralize so-called "aid-for-Russia" by establishing a hair-splitting distinction between the so-called Russian government and the so-called Russian people.

We use the words "so-called" advisedly, because, technically speaking, there no longer exists any such place as Russia; there no longer exists such a people as Russians.

Since 1776, technically speaking, there no longer existed the thirteen British colonies; there no longer existed American colonists.

Following the Bolshevik revolution of 1917, the Russian empire ceased to exist. It became known as the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. This Union consists of seven constituent Republics, one of which is the Russian Socialist Federative Soviet Republic. The remaining six are listed as White Russia, Ukraine, Transcaucasia, Uzbekistan, Turkmenistan and Tajikistan. That is an important point to note in this discussion.

The question therefore arises: Are those who advocate so-called "all aid to Russia" aware of this, or are they employing a mental reservation for the purpose of both salving their own consciences and, at the same time, appearing to conform with the New Deal policy?

So-called "all aid to Russia" does not mean all aid to the Ukrainians or to the rest of the constituent republics, some of which were compelled by force of arms to join the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; some of which suffered from the aggressions of Stalin in a degree as great as Belgium, Holland and Norway suffered from Hitler.

* * *

There is something deceitful surrounding all the oratory and hair-splitting associated with the program of so-called aid to Russia.

As a matter of fact, we are not dealing with Russia at all—but we are dealing with the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics where Communism is practiced in the concrete.

At least, in the name of accuracy and truth, may we challenge those advocates of so-called "all aid to Russia" to change their battle cry to "all aid to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics"?

Elsewhere, we remark how His Holiness, the late Pius XI, used the correct term in extending his sympathy to the people of the Soviet Union; and how the Bishops' pronouncement of November 17th used the incorrect term by referring to the unfortunates as the people of Russia.

There is more than mere terminology at stake in this issue. By insisting on employing an inaccuracy, our opponents are inviting the accusation of "conscience saving" at the price of a practiced error.

And, at the same time, they are misleading millions of faithful followers in co-operating with Communism—followers whose untrained minds are incapable of making the fine moral distinction between Russia and the Soviet Union.

For SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine—its editors, publishers and owners—we are confronted with a grave moral question. We see through the sophistry of those who proclaim an "all aid to Russia" program—a sophistry either consciously or unconsciously expressed. We recognize that were America in the same plight as is the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, it would be a gross error for England, for example, to adopt the policy of "all aid to the Thirteen Colonies."

We know from presidential statement and presidential action that our administration has launched upon a program of "all aid to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics" where Communism lives and thrives and is the motivating force of the central government and the governments of each of the seven constituent republics.

* * *

Therefore, independently of — and, if necessary, contrary to—the foreign policy of our administration, we will not, we dare not subscribe to, or co-operate with, any program of so-called "all aid to Russia" which, stripped of its deceit, its fence-straddling, its "conscience-saving" really forces our people to subscribe to all aid to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

We know our place and our duties. We recognize all power comes from God. We acclaim that what is Caesar's is to be rendered to Caesar.

Nevertheless, we proclaim it is better to serve God than man even though it costs us the freedom of our expression or the freedom of our very lives!

Although we are as anxious as others to save our lives, we are more concerned with saving our consciences as publicists in that we will not lie to our readers by employing a subterfuge; in that we will not hide behind a practiced error in order to be on the side of God and Caesar at the same time.

What the United States needs today *is a few martyrs who will refuse to conform with the mandates of the current Caesars.*

What religion needs today is a few Blessed John Fishers who will refuse to subscribe to the step-by-stepism of the current Henry VIIIs under the pretext of "the common good of the country."

Indeed, national unity is a most cherished objective. But there can be no unity except that which is established on the bedrock of plain truth and plain righteousness. Any fictitious unity dooms its adherents to disaster.

As a point for clerical meditation, let us set down a paragraph from an article entitled *"Soviet Patriotism."* This article appeared in the *World Problem* printed by the Vatican Polyglot Press, Vatican City, February, 1939. It reads as follows:

"The Soviet idea of patriotism has suffered an evolution since the Revolution of October, 1917. At this time the revolutionaries were all internationalists; they eagerly awaited the triumph of the world revolution; and they *suppressed* (N.B. past tense) the very name of Russia and considered the Union of Socialist and Soviet Republics as the first nucleus of a vast Soviet Union which was to encircle the whole world."

No comment on that quotation is required for those who have eyes to read and minds to understand.

Index to Comment

Our Stand on the "All-Aid-to-Russia" (?) Program ..... Page 3

Msgr. Fulton J. Sheen; Peace Pilgrimage ..... Page 4

Another $7-Billion; The War — At Home; Inflation versus Taxation ..... Page 5

Editorials: 'Defense' Cost Double First War; Mrs. F.D.R. and the Middle-West; Rabbi Wise, Internationalist ..... Page 6

The C.I.O. Convention — and Labor ..... Page 7

Behind the War: Speaking of Secret Maps; Mexico Much Closer; Overseas It Is ..... Page 8

Suckers Gypped Again, It's Same Old Show!; Says Jews Back Both Totalitarian Dictators; People Are Pawns ..... Page 9

The Bishops' Pronouncement: "Crisis of Christianity" ..... Page 10

The Object Is War ..... Page 11

Father Coughlin and the 'Tidings' ..... Page 12

Freedom of the Press Nazified; The Fable of the Magic Mortgage ..... Page 13

Monsignor Jackman; London Weekly Review; Alfred Noyes—English Poet ..... Page 14

A Jewish Rabbi Describes La Guardia; F.D.R. Says 'Not in Vain'; Walsh Knows His Navy ..... Page 15

Promises to Finland; Page Msgr. Ryan; Motion Pictures Malodorous ..... Page 18

A Jewish Chronology (Part Three) ..... Page 19

The Catholic Smear ..... Page 20

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen

IN A TELEGRAM handed to the editors of SOCIAL JUSTICE, Monsignor Fulton J. Sheen states:

"Your editorial in this week's SOCIAL JUSTICE has caused considerable confusion. My position concerning aid to Russia was stated in *America* October 18th and was as follows: 'There should be no aid to Russia unless (first) Russia guarantees complete political and religious liberty; (second) unless we suppress Communism at home; (third) if Russia remains communistic it may not act at the council of nations at the close of war.

" 'If these three conditions are not fulfilled we can only say we are interested in fighting a particular barbarism but not barbarism in general.'

"This is anything but all-out aid to Russia. Will you please correct this impression in your next issue?

"Very kindest regards.

(Sgd.) Fulton J. Sheen"

In his original pronouncement Monsignor Sheen either failed to grasp the realistic facts or failed to express them when he discussed the conditions upon which so-called "aid to Russia" could be given.

Available to him was the constitution of the U.S.S.R. published in 1936. The articles of that constitution declare that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a Socialist State; that it came into existence as a result of the overthrow of the power of landlords and capitalists; that all power in the U.S.S.R. belongs to the working people.

The conditions, therefore, set down by Monsignor Sheen for aid to so-called Russia demand that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics must ceast to exist!

* * *

It is true that articles 124 and 125 of the U.S.S.R. 1936 constitution recognize freedom of religious worship and of anti-religious propaganda; and guarantees freedom of speech, freedom of the press, freedom of assemblage and meetings, and freedom of street processions and demonstrations.

Realists recognize there is no freedom of religious worship in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics; no freedom of speech, of press, of assemblage or of demonstration in the U.S.S.R.

It is the practiced policy of the Kremlin to advance the cause of atheism; to suppress freedom of expression and demonstration just as much as it is the practiced policy of the present administration at Washington to advance the cause of labor and to suppress, as its adherents maintain, the practice of exploitation.

The very soul and mentality of the U.S.S.R., as realists recognize, would perish if these policies were changed.

As for the Monsignor's third condition, namely, the ostracizing of the U.S.S.R. from the peace table following this World War, it is a hypothetical presumption which no practical leader should indulge in lest his followers be lured into a moral *cul-de-sac.*

It is obvious to most persons that, should Stalin win, Europe will be communized in short order. Impotent Britain and unprepared America could not, with a Stalin victory, prevent the domination of Europe by Moscow; could not ostracize Stalin from the peace table.

No, Monsignor Sheen did not advocate so-called "all aid to Russia" categorically. Only hypothetically did he do so. But his hypotheses are so unrealistic and presumptuous that he could have said: "Let us withhold all aid from the U.S.S.R. until it ceases to be the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and becomes the Russia that once was and now is no more."

We regret if our readers concluded from our statements that Monsignor Sheen is a total advocate of so-called "all aid to Russia." We did not intend to create that impression. But we do find fault with the Monsignor for having expressed an exaggerated idealism on an occasion when plain facts and naked truth clamored for publication.

Monsignor Fulton Sheen has been a strong fighter against Communism. There is no danger of his aligning himself with those who advocate all aid for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

* * *

Concluding this comment, we set down for our readers a portion of an article on *"The New Soviet Constitution"* written for the *Sign* magazine by George Iensen:

". . . as regards private ownership, two principles are maintained:

"(a) The Communist State remains the sole actual owner of everything, granting to its deserving citizens the use of certain property which may however be revoked at any moment.

"(b) Individuals may use this property for their own needs, and even enrich themselves, but at the same time their right of disposing of their property remains doubtful . . .

"The 'liberty of conscience' is dealt with in *Article 124* which repeats the text of *Article 4* of the *Constitution of 1925* (amended in 1929) that 'liberty of the exercise of religious cults and freedom of anti-religious propaganda belongs to all citizens.' By the maintenance of this article all public teaching of religion is a criminal act, therefore the publishing of an article or book on any subject connected with religion or the refutation of atheist lies and Communist calumnies is impossible; public preaching in a place outside the church comes under the head of 'religious propaganda,' and even a sermon from the pulpit may, if expedient, be interpreted in the same sense. School children, having been included wholesale in the *Union of the godless,* parents who dare speak to them of God do it at their own risk for they become guilty of 'religious propaganda to members of the Union,' and may be denounced and convicted. The teaching of religion to young people under 18 in groups exceeding three, is still a criminal offense, whereas the official creed of the state is atheism, and the *Union of the godless* is an official body protected by the state and assisted in its activity by the Department of Public Education. If the new Constitution does grant the right of vote to ministers of religion, it is only because they are considered such a negligible quantity that it is hoped that this concession, together with that of being allowed to work, will finally sever their connection with the Church. If the new Constitution is considered in the light of the new godless plans of the U.S.S.R., it is clear that no change in the sense of a more tolerant attitude to religion is to take place.

"Another ominous stipulation is expressed in *Article 131* which declares 'enemy of the people' anyone who 'attempts against common socialist property.' The memory of starving peasants executed in the Ukraine in 1934 for stealing a few ears of wheat is too fresh to imagine that the new Article 131 will not be used in the future against similar 'enemies of the people'."

* * *

One thought more: If Hitler conquers Stalin, Monsignor.

Since 1917 children have been brought up on the milk of Soviet atheism under the regime of Lenin and Stalin. The Soviet Union is well atheized by this time.

Not so with Germany. The Catholics and Protestants of Germany are clinging more tenaciously to their religious birthright than ever before. If Hitler wins, he cannot thrive upon peace. The Christians of Germany—still Christians—will overthrow him. There will be the same reaction there as follows in every country resulting from a costly war.

By the same token of "all aid for Russia," why not concern ourselves with "all aid for Germany"—giving to the German people the only opportunity of saving themselves and Western civilization from the red flood of Communism?

Recognize that Naziism represents the German people even less than Communism represents the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Peace Pilgrimage

REV. DR. Edward Lodge Curran, president of the International Catholic Truth Society, and chairman of the Anti-War Crusade, has consented to lead American fathers and mothers in a day of prayer at the National Capitol and the White House, in Washington, D. C., and also at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier in Arlington cemetery.

Invitations to participate have been accepted by a number of members in both houses of the United States Congress.

This is a national pilgrimage of one day, Sunday, December 7th, to the patron saint of the Republic of the United States, the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin Mary, whose feast, a holy day of obligation, will be observed throughout the entire world on Monday, December 8th.

Reservations for chartered buses and special train for Northern Ohio can be obtained at headquarters of the United Mothers of America, 348 Arcade, Cleveland, Ohio (telephone Main 3952).

Chartered buses and the special train will leave Cleveland late Saturday afternoon, December 6th, returning early Monday morning, December 8th.

For additional information call either the above address, or the International Catholic Truth Society, 405-07 Bergen Street, Brooklyn, New York (Telephone Sterling 3-4844).

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Another $7-Billion

ON NOVEMBER 17th, President Roosevelt asked Congress to appropriate another $7-billion for defense purposes.

Before the Government succeeded in letting contracts and spending 40 per cent of the money already allocated by Congress for the pursuit of war, Mr. Roosevelt intemperately asked the people of this country to give him more money than he can possibly spend within the next two years.

Instead of ironing out the many inefficiencies in his defense program, the President has adopted the theory that he can whip Hitler with dollars.

Such a policy is childish; for dollars will have little or nothing to do with the outcome of this war.

Our dollars are based on gold and debt. Hitler's money is based on work and production.

Our gold dollars are not producing goods adequately. Without gold dollars, Hitler is more than producing goods.

Despite the illimitable spending power of Mr. Roosevelt, he has failed to set up a stable foundation for defense—a foundation associated with national unity.

Through the process of promise-breaking he got us into a war which we don't want.

Through a policy of kow-towing to the princes of privilege, he has broken labor and capital wide open in a death struggle to terminate only when labor will win.

Through a system of unfair taxation he is permitting America's big corporations to profit from the war more than they profited from peace.

At the same time, the President created the makings of unrest by consigning hundreds of thousands of young men to military camps on a $21-a-month handout.

The fathers and elder brothers of these young men are making fairly good wages in the factories, but the housewives who buy groceries and commodities are spending the pay envelope money faster than ever before as a result of the higher cost of living—an evil damned publicly and supported privately by the Government.

Seven billion, or seventy billion more dollars, will make no difference in the outcome of this war. That is, it will make no difference when we reap the whirlwind of this windy spending. It will be nothing short of the destruction of the United States' financial and economic systems from within instead of from without.

* * *

This brings us back to the thesis which SOCIAL JUSTICE Magazine expressed originally at the outset of the war. It means an ultimate victory for Karl Marx—a victory brought about chiefly by Mr. Franklin D. Roosevelt and the powers in Britain and America who support him in his injudicious pursuits.

Be prepared, from time to time, to read of Mr. Roosevelt's demanding more billions of dollars.

Be prepared to find Congress voting stupendous sums for his use until the figure of $200-billion defense fund, or more, will have been reached.

Be prepared for the Treasury Department to exact more and more taxes from wage earners, property holders and others.

Be prepared for a species of inflation which will depreciate the purchasing power of your insurance and bond dollars.

Be prepared for a hollow military victory, perhaps, with its attendant financial defeat.

To be sure, we'll "get rid of Hitler," the hard way. But we will also get rid of the American system of living established by our forefathers—a system that developed many headaches, true; a system destroyed by Dr. Roosevelt who cut off its head to cure the headache.

* * *

Meanwhile, have we lost faith in the ability of the German people to get rid of their own domestic menace? If so, we should be prepared, finally, to accept the decapitation we're asking for.

The easy way to get rid of Hitlerism (if that's what we want—and this is doubted) would be to establish a negotiated peace with a substantial hope that the German Catholics and Protestants would take care of the internal affairs of Germany after the sword is returned to its scabbard.

But, no. We've chosen to follow another program—a program of war designed not to defeat Hitler but George Washington, Abraham Lincoln and Jesus Christ!

History will have to decide between Hitler and Roosevelt.

The decision will not be one concerned with measuring the difference of their greatnesses but rather the difference of their ability to destroy.

The War—At Home

THE United States Treasury Department, says the *Philadelphia Record*, is "engaged in a war of nerves."

"It is not against Hitler," the editorial adds, "It's against YOU!

"When Morgenthau talks of great gobs of money loose in people's pockets, and the need for 'mopping it up,' he shows an astounding ignorance of what an American wage-earner's pocket looks like.

"A man who saw his home sold by the sheriff, to satisfy Morgenthau's worries over inflation, would hardly be enthusiastic about defense. What he had to defend is gone!

". . . Nearly 75 per cent of American wage earners are getting no more in their pay envelopes today than they were a year or even two years ago.

"Taking a day's pay a week from such people would amount to a capital levy. With fixed obligations for insurance, mortgages, car payments, etc.—those families would be driven to sell their homes, lapse their insurance, default on car payments — because not one family in a thousand has anything like a day's pay a week to play around with.

"Treasury 'experts' seem unable to realize that Americans would much rather pay higher prices for what they buy—than to be 'protected from higher prices' by having so much of their wages taken away they won't even be able to make ends meet."

Inflation versus Taxes

SECRETARY MORGENTHAU insists that Congress act favorably upon his $5-billion super labor tax, if for no other purpose than to prevent "inflation."

Mr. Morgenthau's Treasury library must be filled with strange text books if he has found such a mumble-jumble of economics in their pages. Indeed, there is a relationship between inflation and taxes. Any high school child recognizes that inflation results primarily from non-productive Government spending.

By non-productive Government spending we mean that type of spending where money is poured down a rathole. In another sense we mean that type of spending where money is spent for cannons, munitions, battleships, airplanes, military training and all other items connected with offensive, destructive warfare whose debts must be paid with interest in sweat dollars to the bankers who created credit money with pen and ink dollars.

Our Federal debt is now in exces of $60-billion. According to informed persons at Washington this New Deal Government plans to increase it to $200-billion to wage an undeclared war for the next eight years.

No keen analysis is required to see what will come of that. As we have been saying for months, and as has been broadcast for years by the Radio Priest, this credit inflation will necessarily mean either taxation or direct repudiation to cancel the debts.

A $200-billion Federal debt on the books when the post-war depression engulfs us will assimilate approximately 90 percent of capital's profit and 60 percent of labor's wages.

When that day comes we will discover, only too late, that we fought not to achieve liberty; not to save the American system of living, but to invite bankruptcy and poverty for all—or, to bow our heads in financial slavery to pay the war-mongers their pound of flesh.

The only way to stop inflation is to stop Government spending on non-productive projects. Taxation instead of being a check to inflation is the forerunner of economic disaster, and of political slavery.

The above remarks are set down as if the science of economics were an abstract thing in itself which it is not. After all, economics is closely associated with the sciences of sociology and psychology.

In other words, the human element has something to say, and more to do, about all this.

That is why we constantly remind the debt-makers and the war-mongers that chaos and revolution can be expected, despite all the economic skull-dudgery of Government officials.

Our people will not submit to any edict forcing them to pay with sweat dollars, the pen and ink dollars.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Published by The Social Justice Publishing Co.

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

'Defense' Cost Double First War

THE UNITED STATES is spending $2,400,000 an hour for armaments. This is almost two and one-half times the rate of spending during our actual participation in the World War.

It cost American taxpayers a million dollars an hour for two years, from the declaration of war in April, 1917, up to the return of the American Army of Occupation.

All of us thought of such expenditures as astronomical; but, they were mere *bagatelle* compared to the present outlay.

In three and a half months of the present fiscal year, the United States—still officially at peace—has spent $4-billion, 250-million for military purposes at home and abroad. This is, approximately, one-fifth of the total direct cost of the nation's entire World War effort.

Administration plans call for the expenditure of $18-billion for "defense" in the current fiscal year. This, with the $6-billion, 250-million spent last year, will bring our peace time "defense" cost above what two years of actual warfare cost us 25 years ago.

These figures are furnished by the Treasury Department.

We have been told bluntly by responsible Government officials that America is prepared to spend $70-billion, if necessary, to defeat Hitler. Already, we are spending more, at peace, than Britain is at war.

The lesson of these fabulous spending figures is plain.

With $13-billion now expended on the *Lend-Lease Act*, with the Treasury Department and the R.F.C. lending more than $1½-billion to Soviet Russia, and with further loans probable, the end of reckless spending is not in sight.

In fact, we have been informed that "this is only the beginning!"

The heaviest tax burden in all history now faces Americans, with still heavier burdens to be added.

A 15 per cent gross income tax to be deducted at the source, has already been proposed by Treasury Secretary Morgenthau.

Despite the unparalleled tax load, the revenue received by the Government will constitute but a small fraction of its expenditures.

If the solvency and credit of the United States Government is to be maintained, the enormous debt, mounting hourly, must sometime be repaid.

Taxpayers will never be able to repay it, if the deficits continue to grow at this increasing rate.

Quite possibly, the solution lies in confiscation of all wealth—socialization of industry and agriculture, the seizure of private property and regimentation of workers. Certainly that is the trend.

Could it be that this regimentation, rather than the cried-up destruction of Hitler, is the planners' goal?

Mrs. F.D.R.—and the Middle-West

IN HER weekly broadcast (commercial coffee) over the N.B.C., Mrs. Roosevelt directed a recent message to the Middle-West. She said that many people in that territory feel secure against invasion and warned that it was largely a false security. With particular reference to Michigan and Ohio, the First Lady said these two States composed, "probably one of the centers of strong America First sentiment."

Thanks for the compliment. We are glad we are not "America last" in sentiment.

The commercial broadcaster incorporated in her speech the thought that Mid-Westerners are not tremendously interested in the war because it mattered little to them if they were "transferred to a new bondage which may be better than the present one."

That was quite an admission, coming from the First Lady. It was tantamount to saying that Hitler couldn't be much worse than her esteemed husband, according to the opinion she had discovered in Michigan and Ohio.

Elsewhere in our comment this week we said that history will have a hard time deciding who caused the world more damage—Hitler or Roosevelt. Hitler persecutes only Catholics, Protestants and Jews. By his war-mongering and astronomical tax system, Roosevelt will persecute Catholics, Protestants, Jews and non-religionists by taking from them the Stars and Stripes and leaving in its stead the worn tail of a shirt!

Rabbi Wise—Internationalist

AT ONE of the most tempestuous meetings held in Ford Hall Forum, Boston, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise denounced Norman Thomas as an evil influence in American life; called Charles A. Lindbergh an ammoral being; and assailed U. S. Senator Cabot Lodge as one of the men who prevented America's entry into the League of Nations and, therefore, is more responsible for the present World War than Hitler himself.

Rabbi Wise is not a nationalist. By proclivity he is a dyed-in-the-red internationalist. To him, Americanism is isolationism. To him, internationalism is interventionism.

From the outset, Americanism was identified with nationalism, as against imperialism or any other ism which implied the dependence of the original Thirteen Colonies upon any other nation.

From the beginning, Communism was international—the only avowed internationalism known to the world until, perchance, it was interpreted that Hitler desired to internationalize civilization.

It is interesting to note that Dr. Chaim Weizmann, president of the World Zionist Organization and the Jewish Agency for Palestine, recently condemned the British policy as affecting Jews.

Dr. Weizmann said: "Jews have been penalized for their loyalty and devotion to Britain." He added that he was "unable to record anything except disappointment and frustration" from Britain.

This spokesman for Jewry definitely has indicated the attitude of leading Jews throughout the world towards Britain. Therefore, Rabbi Wise and those Jews who support him are now finding themselves interested in intervention more for maintaining the existence of the U.S.S.R. than for aiding the British Empire.

Nevertheless, Rabbi Wise is the leading Jewish voice in America. He is accepted by Catholics and Protestants as the equivalent of the American Pope of Jewry. Unwittingly perhaps, he compromises every Jew who loves America more than Moscow.

Third Term—or Fourth

"NOTWITHSTANDING the decline in Jefferson's popularity, many of the state legislatures invited him to stand for a third election. But he declined; not on the ground taken by Washington twelve years before, but because, as he claimed, it was well to establish a precedent for the future. He was the author, therefore, of our unwritten law that no man serve more than eight years in the presidency. He was one of our two or three Presidents who, having served two terms, might have been elected for a third; yet many believed that his embargo would have rendered his election doubtful had he desired a third term."

—History of the United States, by Henry William Elson
(Chapter XXI "The War of 1812")

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

The C. I. O. Convention —and Labor

PHILIP MURRAY unanimously was returned to the highest office in the C.I.O. during the closing hours of its annual convention held at Detroit Thanksgiving week (November 21).

The highlights of the convention were these:

1. The C.I.O. stood behind John L. Lewis and the 53,000 miners involved in the captive mine strikes.

2. The C.I.O. endorsed President Roosevelt's foreign policy.

3. The C.I.O. officially advertised its determination to assist in ridding the world of Hitlerism.

4. The C.I.O. condemned the O.P.M. officials for their alleged "extra-legal" action in denying the Currier Lumber Company of Detroit the award of the Wayne Housing contract, but detoured critical mention of Sidney T. Hillman.

5. The C.I.O. made no mention of its opposition to Stalinism or Communism.

' ' '

Thus was brought to a close one of the strangest labor conventions in the history of labor.

The lobbies of some metropolitan hotels were scenes of occasional disorder, sarcastic remarks and one or two fist fights. The disorder and fist fights were occasioned not by those who opposed Philip Murray but by those factions who drew their swords against Sidney Hillman and the Communist leaders inside the C.I.O.

At this writing a request of the President has obtained a truce in the strike of the captive coal mines. However, the ultimate outcome of its further arbitration is undetermined.

We dare to predict however, that if President Roosevelt employs troops to "break" the strike, the entire C.I.O. in all its branches will stage a sympathy strike of labor throughout the nation.

Mr. Roosevelt is aware of this. Possibly, the President is morbidly reflecting upon his past policies which were blueprinted to coddle Communists and communistic principles within the C.I.O.

Fact-facing Americans recognize that some communistic principles are here to stay in America. The thin wedge through which these principles gained entrance into our national life is traceable not to John L. Lewis, not to Harry Bridges or any "Red" labor leader, but to Associate Justice Frank Murphy who, as Governor of Michigan, employed state troops to support sit-downism, seizure-of-propertism and other industrial abuses, which no real friend of labor and no real patriot who loves America should conscientiously condone.

At that time the former Governor of Michigan expressed concern over the possible shedding of blood when it was his sworn duty to eject from privately owned property a group of trespassers and sit-downers and seizurists.

Today, the shedding of blood is taking place in West Virginia and Pennsylvania mines.

And it is only a preface of what awaits America if Americans attempt to withstand the onward march of C.I.O.-ism in its unadvertised objective to seize the Capital of the United States and all the machinery of Government!

' ' '

If and when such an event occurs, it will not be the first time that the Capital of the United States and the machinery of Government were seized by one class of citizen. Prior to the first World War—at least since the passing of the *Federal Reserve Banking Act* in 1913 — this country has been controlled by capital which cared little about labor and labor's rights.

It was capital—international capital, if you please — that persuaded the United States to get into the first World War.

It was capital that profiteered as a result of the first World War.

It was capital that dictated the unjust *Peace Treaty of Versailles* concluding the first World War.

It was capital whose policies brought about the depression, following the first World War.

It was capital that put financial rights above human rights from 1920 through 1932.

It was capital that seized homes and farms by the hundreds of thousands; that enunciated the danger of paying the Soldiers' Bonus for fear of creating "inflation"; that bestowed billions of dollars of gifts on Europeans and cold words of sympathy upon Americans.

Then came the demagoguery of Franklin D. Roosevelt which won the support of labor, agriculture and small business—a support which elected him to the Presidency of the United States.

Quickly followed the *Wagner Labor Act,* the establishment of the N.L.R.B., the decisions of the Supreme Court and the planned up-building of a labor party whose leaders, like the Bourbon kings, could do no wrong.

' ' '

Only a presumptuous person refuses to see what is in the offing for the United States.

According to our viewpoint, the President, who has now turned against the Frankenstein creation of the C.I.O. which he built, apparently is pandering to the princes of privilege who, a few years ago, he badgered and castigated.

As usual, these princes cannot read the handwriting on the wall. They are inclined to believe that the President and his socialistic advisers are honest in their present advances. They are inclined to believe that the Administration is sincere in its all-aid-to-Britain policy and in its national defense program.

To our way of thinking these *are only ruses to bring about a climax of hostilities between capital and labor.*

Even though Mr. Roosevelt himself is honest, those who manipulate his mind and formulate his policies are intent upon socializing or communizing or nazifying the United States through this impending clash between capital and labor.

Ponder well upon the refusal of the C.I.O. to take a stand against Communism in its own ranks. Ponder well upon the position in which John L. Lewis has been placed by Sidney Hillman, Harry Bridges, Allen Haywood, Michael Widman and others occupying senior positions within the C.I.O.

Is it possible for Mr. Roosevelt to placate the angry attitude of the C.I.O.? It is, provided he would put a ceiling on prices for food, rent, clothing and other commodities consumed by the laboring class. This he will not do.

And how will one translate his refusal to do this obviously necessary thing?

It will mean a continuation of strikes for higher wages until such time as strikes will be outlawed.

And when strikes are outlawed what will be the result?

The Socialist Labor Party says: ..."(We) summon the American working class to make use of its revolutionary right, to unite politically to demand the unconditional surrender of capitalism, to mobilize industrially into a mighty Socialist Industrial Union to enforce the decision of the majority."

May we remind our readers that *Articles 1, 2 and 3* of the *Constitution of the U.S.S.R.* (1936) read: "The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics is a Socialist State of workers and peasants. The political foundation of the U.S.S.R. consists of Soviets of Working People's Deputies, which grew up and became strong as a result of the overthrow of the power of landlords, of capitalists and the winning of the dictatorship of the proletariat. All power in the U.S.S.R. belongs to the working people of town and country as represented by Soviets of Working People's Deputies."

' ' '

In the wake of the C.I.O. convention Congress will be asked to pass a law prohibiting all strikes during the emergency. As far as we can discover, members of Congress are beginning to feel that only through compulsory arbitration and the restoration to the courts of the power of injunction in labor disputes can a remedy be found.

Of course labor has the right to strike when all other means fail. But Congress has the right to supply means, namely, courts, which will obviate the necessity of strikes.

Had Mr. Roosevelt established the N.L.R.B. on an impartial basis instead of packing that organization with bigoted radicals, strikes would have been reduced to a minimum.

All that is water over the dam. It may be too late to set up an impartial board or court. If capital has an ounce of judgment left, it can foresee that any board or court about to be set up by Congress will be a labor-minded board or court.

Meanwhile, the fat is in the fire. Fact-facing men are clothing themselves with asbestos suits as far as it is possible.

' ' '

In concluding this comment it is interesting to set down two thoughts:

1. David Dubinsky, president of the International Ladies Garment Workers Union (A. F. of L.) is considering withdrawing

(Continued on Page 15)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Behind the War

Speaking of Secret Maps

THAT "secret map" dividing South America into vassal Nazi States, which was discovered by the President in his Navy Day speech, was obtained from a high ranking German agent whose papers and luggage were seized while he was en route to Buenos Aires by way of Japan.

The map was picked up by the British Intelligence service in its regular procedure of stopping and searching Japanese ships bound for South America and carrying German, Italian or Japanese commercial agents.

President Roosevelt based his charge that the Germans had "plans to conquer the world" on this map, whose "authenticity" the Germans deny.

However, the map is almost identical with one obtained by the liberal Argentine government in 1938. This map was shown to members of the United States State Department at that time, in an effort to persuade Secretary Hull not to co-operate with General Franco in Spain.

Liberal Argentinians charged that Franco was the "stooge" of Hitler and Mussolini and that, in exchange for German and Italian aid, Franco had promised to exert Spanish influence over the Spanish and Portuguese in South America, to bring the Latin nations into the economic and ideological sphere of Europe's "new order."

However, in 1938, the map was ridiculed by the American State Department which refused to aid the Loyalists by lifting the embargo on arms.

* * *

The map showing South America divided into five "States" was published by the *Daily Mirror* (Aug. 25, 1941) fully two months before the President's address.

The map, reportedly, was drawn from a description of a map seized in a police raid on a Nazi group in Argentina. It might be well to remember that not many weeks before the President spoke, members of a "Dies Committee of Argentina" came to Washington to report personally on the extent of Nazi infiltration in Argentina. Conceivably this investigating committee of the Argentine government brought along a copy of the map which was placed in the President's hands.

At least two months before, the *New York Times* had published information concerning this supposedly "secret Nazi map" of South America, while the *Christian Science Monitor* of a few weeks earlier also spoke of the "secret documents" for the suppression of Catholicism in South America.

Obviously, the President drew from his Navy Day address upon these sources.

The maps indicate that the Nazis would divide five States of South America into 117 political units, each of which would be ruled by a Nazi "*quisling*" who, in turn, would be subject to one of the Nazi *gauleiters* appointed for the five States.

* * *

All this to-do about secret Nazi maps brings to mind the existence of a prior Communist map showing the division of the United States of America into various Socialist Republics. On this map, seen originally in Joe Stalin's office, the city of Detroit, Michigan, was re-named "Lewistown," after John L. Lewis, leader of the radical C.I.O. through whom the Comintern was then working.

Our entire nation of 48 States was arbitrarily divided into "Republics," or "T.V.A. areas," and a "New (Deal) Order" boss was contemplated to be set up over each.

We have heard nothing from the Roosevelt administration about this Soviet map which proposed to divide the United States, but we are supposed to be frightened out of our complacency by some Nazi map dividing up South America.

We do not think that the Roosevelt administration would assert that Soviet Russia had "designs and plans to sovietize the United States" by internal revolution and general strike; but Mr. Roosevelt did say that the Nazis plan to attack the United States. And he based this warning upon his information that the *Gestapo* had plans for some internal *coups* in South America.

The President knows, as well as the readers of this National Magazine, that Nazi Germany simply cannot "attack" South America, especially Argentina, from without; hence, these nations must be conquered from within.

The New Deal administration reasons from all this that the Nazis plan an "attack" on North America.

While we're on all this business of secret maps, therefore, and frightened to the point of belligerency over a secret Nazi map for the "conquest" of South America, how about looking into this companion map outlining a plan for the Soviet conquest of the United States?

Certainly, there are more Communists in key posts in Washington, D. C., than Nazis. Personally, we believe that real Americans are much more concerned about the Stalin map than the Hitler one.

* * *

Of course, the Argentine government has investigated Naziism; and, since the United States inaugurated its hemisphere solidarity and defense plan, the Argentinian government has doubtless turned over to the New Deal the result of its investigations.

Thus, the Roosevelt administration hopes to use the material of the South American "Dies Committee"; while suppressing the information turned up by our own Dies Committee here at home.

The more remote information is to be used to whip the United States to a war fever. For, if it can be shown that Germany, Italy and Japan have "secret plans" against South America, maybe some justification can be worked up for the United States declaring war on the Axis nations—a war of "self-defense to repel aggression and invasion."

Mexico Much Closer

NOT MANY years ago both Catholics and non-Catholics in this country pointed out the Soviet menace in the Communist government of Mexico, our nearest neighbor—actually next door to Texas, just across the Rio Grande.

The Moscow Comintern had established a Communist government in Mexico which indulged in the most heinous sort of anti-God oppression, persecution and terrorism.

Soviet Russia "invaded" Mexico and, through *agit-prop* technique and Moscow gold, pulled off a *coup* to set up a Communist regime.

The administration at Washington was asked to exert pressure on the Calles-Cardenas government. There was precedent for this, America having previously put the pressure on other governments.

The United States Government refused to take action, even when it was shown that Communist Russia had sovietized Mexico and planned to use Mexico as a base from which to "invade the United States" with *agit-propaganda*, sabotage, espionage and revolution!

The Roosevelt administration explained that the United States "cannot interfere in the internal affairs of foreign nations."

But since that day the Roosevelt administration has meddled plenty in the internal affairs of many nations. Right now, we are up to our ears in interference in South America.

Is it not significant—not to say ominous—that the sovietization of nearer nations has never bothered the Roosevelt administration, while the threat of some mythical "nazification" in far-off South America has so worried the New Deal that our interference in the internal affairs of those nations is a matter of routine diplomacy?

Overseas It Is

ARMY CHIEF of Staff George C. Marshall says there's nothing to it, but nevertheless the War Department admits it is making a drive for three-year Army enlistments among draftees and National Guardsmen, and is also asking the men whether they would be willing to serve overseas.

Enlisted men and officers in an armored division engaged in maneuvers in the Carolinas were asked:

"Would you be willing to serve overseas with an armored division?"

A simple yes or no answer was required.

Attempting to quash rumors that any A.E.F. was being planned, General Marshall issued a formal statement saying that the overseas units were desired only to man fortifications in the nation's outlying possessions, in the Atlantic bases received from Britain and to relieve the Marines on duty in Iceland.

If that be the situation, why doesn't the War Department just ask the men whether they would serve in the places mentioned by General Marshall, rather than employ the vague term "overseas"?

We believe we know the answer. It is simple. As Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Knox or Mr. Stimson might put it: "We must be prepared for any contingency."

Months ago the superannuated jingoist who beats the war drums in his official capacity as Secretary of War, warned Americans that they must be prepared to fight abroad.

Evidently he knew what he was talking about, insofar as Administration plans are concerned.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Suckers Gypped Again; It's Same Old Show!

WITH THE curtain for the final act of Mr. Roosevelt's war drama about to rise, 80 per cent of the great audience of 130-million Americans remains unresponsive.

In the parlance of the show business, the 80 per cent are "sitting on their hands." They are not applauding the play, the author or the actors because they feel they have been deceived.

The audience paid its money to see a Peace performance. The presentation was so advertised; but, having gotten the chumps into the theatre, the producer deftly switched the show and put on a revival of a "flop" which had been foisted on the same sucker audience 25 years before!

Circumstance has forced the addition of a few new lines which make the play even more unpalatable than the original.

Substantially the plot is this: The United States must insure a British victory at any cost. We must go to war, if necessary, to drive the scourge of Hitlerism from the face of the earth.

But the audience, for the most part, is disappointed in this theme, since the posters outside stated clearly that the drama concerned defense of America and avoidance of foreign wars.

If the play runs its programmed course, the United States must again take up the fight when all of continental Europe has been vanquished, leaving us alone to accomplish the apparently impossible task of invasion and conquest.

Today, with the Soviet Union engaging Hitler in the East, Great Britain stands aloof, unable or unwilling to attempt the invasion which her generals say is essential for victory.

In two years of fighting Britain has a casualty list of 134,000 killed, wounded, and captured. In only three months of fighting, Soviet Russia has lost more than 2½-million men. Britain stands by and watches them fall, all the while pleading for more aid from America. Of Britain's fighting men only the gallant boys of the R.A.F. are pressed into action. The huge standing army continues to stand—idle in England and the Near East.

' ' '

A glance at the casualty lists of Britain's erstwhile allies in the present war reveals strikingly how those nations paid in men for fighting a war declared by Britain. Accepting at face value British promises of immediate aid, those nations fought Britain's war, but received no material fulfillment of the promises.

They went down to gory defeat while Britain fortified her tight little isle and watched the carnage from a distance.

Figures of dead, wounded and captured for the various countries who placed their trust in Britain show the following losses:

Poland	1,675,000
France	2,365,000
Belgium	230,000
Holland	160,000
Greece	95,000
Norway	5,000
Yugoslavia	225,000
Soviet Russia	2,585,000

Britain's losses to date, we repeat, are approximately 134,000.

' ' '

If the United States enters the war on a full scale, hundreds of thousands—perhaps, millions—of American boys will be slaughtered; for it will be they who are to be shouldered with the job of invading the Continent.

Military experts estimate that a force of 10-million soldiers would be required to carry out a successful attack on Germany by land, and it is known that Britain can not muster half that number.

Furthermore, the British view seems to be that England's army must be kept in England to guard against a possible Nazi attack on the island. Yet Generals Wavell and Auchinleck, two of Britain's ablest militarists, have said unequivocally that Hitler can be beaten only by an invasion of the Continent.

That puts the task directly in the lap of the United States.

Forgetting for the moment the tremendous loss in human lives that such an undertaking would involve, is such a plan feasible in view of our geographical situation and the developments of modern warfare?

Nowadays an army must have an enormous number of machines—tanks, trucks, mobile guns, etc., to say nothing of airplanes. These machines are heavy and cumbersome and must be supplied with an uninterrupted flow of fuel and munitions. Food must be provided for the operators and mechanics of the machines.

These needs have changed the complexion of ocean transportation necessary for offensive action on a large scale from such a great distance. Formerly, transportation experts figured that one ton of shipping was sufficient for the transportation of one soldier, his equipment and his food. Now, every tank demands six tons of shipping for each ton of its own weight, and each man requires eight tons.

This means that a vast armada of cargo carriers, above and beyond anything ever built, would be needed to insure any large American offensive in Europe or Asia a chance of success.

So much shipping tonnage is required to put an army in action that the sea power America possesses at the present would be negligible compared to the requirements; and convoying all the cargo carriers, transports and tankers to the ports of destination would be impossible.

That is not all. The foregoing does not take into consideration the number of aircraft carriers or other ships that would be needed to transport a sufficient number of airplanes across the sea. Only the larger types of bombers are able to fly the ocean. Small bombers, observation and fighting planes must be shipped.

' ' '

The problem of offensive action, therefore, against an army which has rolled from one end of Europe to the other is so great that a strong doubt arises as to whether sea power has not been neutralized in this era by mechanized land power.

If the fleet has not been neutralized completely for offensive action, then it is hampered so greatly that the old conception of sea power has changed radically.

These facts should be remembered by all Americans and particularly by those inclined to listen to the jingoist cries for a declaration of war against Germany. An attempted invasion of the continent of Europe by an American Expeditionary Force, unless the situation on the Continent is radically changed, would probably be disastrous.

Says Jews Back Both Totalitarian Dictators

JEWISH bankers are "no better and no worse than the Episcopalian bankers or the Catholic bankers or the Mohammedan bankers," says George Seldes, editor of the news letter *"In Fact."*

"For a long time," he continues, "several Jewish bankers dealt with Hitler and the Nazis. They said anti-Semitism was all right because it was directed against the poor, the refugees, the Jewish workingmen, not the rich bankers.

"They showed no 'race' or 'blood' ties with the poor. To this day a Jewish banker works for Hitler. (Baron Max von Oppenheim, who said that Hitler was fighting only Bolshevism, that nice people need not be afraid of him. Hitler has raised Baron Max to Honorary Aryan status.—*Time*, June 16, 1941.)

"Banker Guiseppi Toeplitz of Milan collected the funds which paid for Mussolini's blackshirt army and put the Duce in power. He, too, was a Jew."

The People Are Pawns

PEOPLE are beginning to see that they are only pawns, writes Thomas L. Stokes, Scripps-Howard staff writer in the *Pittsburgh Press.*

"The war," he says, "has come to Main Street.

"The talk used to be of what Congress was doing, and it was all far away and vague and mostly a matter of curiosity and of curbstone opinion not given or taken too seriously. But now they find that what is important to their lives are the words and decisions of what were jokingly called in the early N.R.A. days of the New Deal "the commissars," the men who now are really important.

"What Donald Nelson and Leon Henderson and William Knudsen and Sidney Hillman do and think is what counts now. Congress is just a body to ratify, and to write letters to. When a man really gets in trouble and needs help and writes to his Congressman, he gets a letter back saying the matter has been referred to such and such official of this or that news agency.

"What does it all mean?

"The Midwest wonders — but keeps its nose at the grindstone."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bishops' Pronouncement

'Crisis of Christianity'

THE Administrative Board of the National Catholic Welfare Conference, acting in behalf of all the bishops of the United States, publicized a statement on November 17th. Its release followed the annual meeting of the Catholic bishops held at Washington.

The pronouncement was prefaced by these words: "Christianity faces today its most serious crisis since the Church came out of the catacombs."

Catholics and Protestants, Jews and Gentiles, citizens and officials and foreign diplomats, will accept the *"Crisis of Christianity"* as the official word of the Catholic Church in the United States of America.

In the third paragraph of their statement the bishops referred to "the two greatest evils of today . . . two subversive forces, both in control of powerful governments, both bent on world dominance . . . Naziism and Communism."

While the majority of Americans agree with that description of Naziism and Communism, there are some inquisitive and analytical minds concerned with the causes which produced these evils. And if they are concerned with the causes, they are also scientific enough to recognize that the effects—Communism and Naziism—cannot be liquidated until the causes themselves are eradicated.

Specifically, the bishops' pronouncement did not touch upon this phase of the crisis. It would be impossible, probably, to do so within the confines of a brief pronouncement except through the medium of generalities.

Nevertheless, back of Communism and Karl Marx, there was international capitalism which built up the financial imperialism notable for its exploitation of the masses and its concentration of wealth in the hands of a few, chiefly through the instrumentality of money and credit which the few controlled to the detriment of the many.

And identified with international capitalism and financial imperialism, was the universal abuse of a "new kind of usury" which permitted the few who controlled money and credit to issue or withdraw loans at will; to create or cancel money at will; to manipulate the rise and fall of prices at will; to beget prosperity or depression at will; to shuttle gold from one capital to another at will; and to profit, through interest, on loans which were mere bookkeeping entries — loans which borrowers were forced to pay back with money earned by the sweat of the brow.

Economically and financially, the causes of Communism and Naziism are traceable to that type of international capitalism.

* * *

Nor did the pronouncement of the bishops touch upon the political cause of Naziism—the same Naziism which, seemingly, the *"Crisis of Christianity"* sets down as the first of the two greatest evils, with Communism in the second place. The words of the pronouncement read: ". . . the two greatest evils of today . . . Naziism and Communism."

From a political viewpoint, it is remembered that Communism gained a foothold in Russia in 1917 when international bankers in Germany and elsewhere financed a group of radicals to fifth columnize Russia. Following the October revolution of 1917, the Communists who had gained control of the country formerly known as Russia, set forth to create a world revolution.

As a result of the iniquitous *Peace Treaty of Versailles* which terminated the first World War, Germany became a very fertile field for Communist activities. The *Peace Treaty* had denuded Germany of its last ounce of gold; had encumbered the German citizens with unpayable debts; had imposed upon the nation a system of planned poverty which was intolerable.

When the entire future of Germany was enshrouded by the clouds of black despair, the Chancellor of the Republic, Herr Breuning, appealed to Leon Blum, Premier of France, for a credit loan with which to purchase raw materials and to set in motion the rusting machinery of industrial Germany.

Chancellor Breuning knew it was necessary to get Germany back to profitable industrial work in order to stem the Red tide of Communism which had manifested itself in a national election when 5-million votes were cast in support of Communist candidates for public office!

As we remember, Breuning's request for a loan from Blum was not granted. And the factories and workers remained idle.

At that time Adolf Hitler rapidly was rising to power as he orated against the iniquities of the *Peace Treaty of Versailles* and the financial and economic slavery to which his people had been reduced by the operators of international capitalism and imperial financialism.

Moreover, Hitler lost no occasion to appeal to the forthright Catholics and Protestants of Germany to join with him in opposing Communism—the same Catholics and Protestants who had been shackled economically and financially by the international bankers.

Thus, Naziism grew apace. Its followers were not educated bishops and priests who foresaw the effects of some of its basic principles. But millions of idle workers, millions of propertyless citizens, millions of bankrupt merchants and farmers rallied behind the only leader who had the courage and ability to speak out against the two pressing evils of Communism and international capitalism.

Unfortunately, there was no Catholic bishop, priest or layman; no Protestant pastor or politician able to cope with the Austrian paperhanger. Possibly, the Catholic and Protestant leaders were too prone to render to a foreign Caesar the things that belonged to the domestic Germans.

Meanwhile, Hitler rose to power, aided and abetted by international bankers and industrialists in England and elsewhere who began to fear the incursions of Communism; who began to agree that a Hitlerian Germany would prove to be a Chinese wall, as it were, against the spread of Stalin's international revolution.

Politically, therefore, historians can place a finger upon the cause of the effects known as Naziism. And this cause grew out of the *Peace Treaty of Versailles.*

However, the effects of these causes are with us in the forms of Communism and Naziism.

* * *

Other causes contributed to their formation. Specifically, there was the religious cause. For centuries the Greek Orthodox Church—not united with Rome—was the official church of Russia. Either through ignorance or compromise, its officials were unable to contribute much towards the material welfare of the Russian people. Like the Bourbon clergy of France in former days, the clergy of Russia were too palace-minded. Added to that cause were other century-old facts stemming, at least, from the days of Pope Leo X. A religious revolution in the sixteenth century resulted in a disunited Christendom, a disrespected episcopacy and the birth of a naturalistic concept of life.

To write more on that point is not appropriate at this time.

* * *

Our main thesis, however, is this: To remove the evils of Communism and Naziism it is positively necessary to remove the causes—the economic and financial causes; the political causes and the religious causes.

As far as we know, the Allies—including Great Britain and the United States—are not vitally concerned with removing any of these causes. It is our opinion that both Great Britain and the United States are more concerned with preserving the abuses of international financialism and economic domination — "our way of life," as their spokesman describes it.

Nowhere in the bishops' pronouncement were these causes set down and condemned in unmistakable language. Nevertheless, their pronouncement was filled with references to Leo XIII, Pius XI and Pius XII condemning Naziism and Communism, with some small space used to make any mention of the abuses of capitalism.

The pronouncement is notable in that it does not directly applaud the policy of so-called "all-aid-to-Russia." By a slip of the pen, we hope, those responsible for writing the pronouncement said that "Pope Pius XI . . . expressed . . . his paternal and compassionate benevolence for the people of Russia in these words:

" 'In making these observations it is no part of our intention to condemn en masse the peoples of the Soviet Union'."

Pope Pius XI did not express "his paternal and compassionate benevolence" for the people of Russia, as the pronouncement of the bishops reads. The Pope was concerned with "the peoples of the Soviet Union."

And this seemingly insignificant error on the part of the authors of the *"Crisis of Christianity"* is of value in these days when the people of America are being besieged with the deceit of "all-aid-for-Russia." The fact is that, technically and legally, there is no Russia and no Russian people. The fact is that the one-time people of one-time Russia are the present people of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

Truly, much importance should not be attached to this slip of the pen insofar as His Holiness sympathizes with the people of the Soviet Union. But much importance is attached to the bishops' pronouncement insofar as it does not uphold Bishop Hurley's all-out "aid to Russia" program.

* * *

Very timely was the bishops' pronouncement in that it distinguished the two

(Continued on Page 11)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

'Crisis of Christianity'

(Continued from Page 10)

spheres of regimen, each complete in itself; each established by God Himself. We mean that temporal and civil sphere operated by the rulers of this world; we mean that spiritual and ecclesiastical sphere operated by the Vicar of Christ and his successors in office. That the officials in each sphere should be respected in their sphere is agreed upon by every person. "Disrespect for authority, both ecclesiastical and civil, must be condemned." That quotation was crying for expression these many years in the United States.

Immediately following the above words, we read: "In the confusion of the hour, we deplore the presumption of those who, lacking authority, strive to determine the course of action that the Church should take within her clearly defined field."

Our thanks is doubly due the bishops for including in their pronouncement that stinging statement. It is a statement applicable to politicians — Catholic in name — who would speak for the Church. It is a statement to be digested by clerics of all ranks —with the exception of His Holiness the Pope—who would speak for the Church.

It is a consoling statement to the millions of Catholics in the United States who know they cannot co-operate with either Communism or Naziism in any manner whatsoever.

The fact is, His Holiness the Pope has not taken sides with either party or against either party. He has condemned both the governments of Germany and of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. He has sympathized with the peoples of both countries, refusing to injure any of them. And that will be the mirror in which Catholics as Catholics will dress themselves.

* * *

As Americans—as well as Catholics—we may either conform or refuse to conform with the President of our country.

As Americans, we must conform with the Government but may refuse to conform with the Administration.

These are two different concepts—the Government and the Administration.

By the Administration we mean the Chief Executive and his assistants. By the Government we mean the Administration plus the Supreme Court, plus the Congress of the United States and plus the *Constitution of the United States.*

If the Administration makes war, as it is now doing, we need not conform with the Administration until the Government declares war, which it has not done.

Nevertheless, it is our duty to respect the authority of office just as much as it is the President's duty to respect the authority of Congress and of the *Constitution.*

* * *

The bishops' pronouncement is notable for many other timely statements. It said:

"We cannot avoid the repercussions of a world cataclysm . . . we are gravely concerned with the future of supernatural religion in our country. Here, as elsewhere, it is seriously threatened by growing evils of which our Holy Father has but recently warned the world. These are the evils of 'False doctrine, immorality, disbelief and reborn paganism'."

The concluding paragraphs of the pronouncement were concerned with capital and labor. They were mostly restricted to quotations from Pope Leo XIII with which most of our people are now acquainted.

And the final paragraph was couched in the form of a prayer asking the Holy Spirit to guide and strengthen our Chief Executive, the Congress and all who bear the great responsibilities of government in these difficult days.

The sympathy of the American Catholics is extended to the bishops whose duty it is to carry the cross during these perilous times. The pectoral cross worn by a bishop, together with the colored vestments, are symbols with a definite meaning. They indicate that a bishop is to be a cross-bearer, not a crown-wearer; a martyr, not a king.

Our prayer is for them that, invested with the grace of the Holy Spirit, they will learn from the past: learn from their mighty predecessors who suffered and died rather than compromise with political upstarts who, like Pontius Pilate, disdainfully asked "What is truth?"—the same Pontius Pilate who did not recognize the Truth Incarnate as He stood before him.

The Catholic people of the United States would be content to suffer their physical properties taxed out of existence rather than have even one of their bishops play the part of a Cranmer.

The Object Is War

THE REAL object of those who voted for amendment of the *Neutrality Act* is not to give unnecessary aid to England, but to "embroil our nation in a European war," declared the Hon. John T. Taheny, San Francisco lawyer, in a broadcast under auspices of the America First Committee.

"England does not need our shipping," the speaker pointed out. "She does not need our men. Figures released by the United States Maritime Commission show that England has ample shipping.

"The amending of the *Neutrality Act* was not necessary to supply England; but it was advocated solely to provoke incidents which the war-mongers hope will involve us in war."

The broadcast, which was one in a series calling upon peace-loving Americans to "keep the *Neutrality Act,*" was in part as follows:

"At least ten comprehensive sectional and national polls have been taken on the specific question whether America should enter the war and attempt to defeat Germany. Every one showed overwhelming opposition to war. Yet speakers who undertake publicly to justify this opposition are generally slurred and reviled.

"In a radio debate last month an official of the *Committee to Defend America* described such Americans as Quislings, Hitler-helpers, defeatists, appeasers, fifth-columnists, copperheads, and subversive elements. This is a vicious form of intolerance. Spewing such epithets from the mire and filth of prejudice and hatred belong to the days of the witch-hunters.

"Such muckraking, coupled with false appeals for unity, is the method by which a cowardly and underhanded assault is being made on the right of free speech and free assembly. It has instigated unthinking persons to oppose the renting of halls to those who advocate peace.

"The issues of the day should be discussed without rancor or hatred against any person, group, race, creed or nation. To preserve free speech we must accord to those with whom we disagree, aye, even to those whose opinions we detest, a place to assemble and speak freely.

"The secret conspiring of one group against another is un-American.

"The *Committee to Defend America* is actively seeking a form of unity which would repress all criticism or opposition to any policy of the administration. It seeks to spread the false notion that loyalty requires meek submission to whatever may be proposed. The truth is that one may be loyal to the United States and yet disagree with particular policies of those in office.

* * *

"When the World War ended the nations showed their true colors," the speaker said. "Their professions of high principle during the war were revealed as mere sham and propaganda. The 'Fourteen Points' were regarded with contempt. Each nation showed that its only interest was to get what it could for itself. The policies which for generations had bloodied the soil of Europe were the policies which controlled at the peace table. There is no reason to expect that the crushing of Germany would find them any different . . .

"And if Germany were defeated, we would probably find ourselves confronted with a worse European situation than that which followed the last war. That was a 'war for democracy,' but it was followed by less democracy than existed before. Russia would probably seek to take back Finland, Poland, Bessarabia, Latvia, Esthonia and Lithuania. Communism would probably spread all over Europe. If Russia did not get Poland, Poland would probably want Lithuania. And there is little to choose between the Polish atrocities in Lithuania and the Russian atrocities in Poland.

"Every defeated nation in Europe would rise. The contention between them over boundaries, and the tariff walls and economic war that would ensue, would make permanent peace in Europe as remote as it was under the *Treaty of Versailles.* If any American historian has characterized that treaty otherwise than as infamous, I have not heard of him. Hate and revenge again would dictate the terms of peace.

"It is unlikely that there ever will be permanent peace in Europe except on the basis of a commercial union, with political autonomy in the units, under the hegemony of a strong power. Call that power a policeman or what you will, permanent peace will not come until that policeman assumes his place. A voluntary integration of the various nations does not appear likely.

"If England should succeed in restoring her balance of power policy, it is obvious that permanent peace would be even further away. It was recognition of the war-breeding potentiality of this policy which prompted the late Lord Lothian, former Ambassador to the United States and a profound student of the European situation, to state to the House of Lords in 1937: 'If we withdraw from Europe, it is the best contribution we can possibly make to the peace of Europe today.'

"England's war needs do not require American shipping in English ports. But if such shipping were necessary, any ships put into England's war service *should be transferred to the English flag.*"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Father Coughlin and the 'Tidings'

THE OFFICIAL organ of the archdiocese of Los Angeles takes to task Theodore Maynard's article in the October issue of the *American Mercury*. Prof. Maynard, of Naim College, chided Americans who are known as interventionists.

The *Tidings* (Nov. 7) has this to say of him:

"We pursued his reasoning along interventionist lines until he chided those Americans who told themselves that what was going on in Europe 'is . . . war between rival imperialisms.'

" 'This,' he said, 'is the stock in trade of all interventionists. Catholic isolationists do no more than repeat the arguments of Senator Wheeler and Mr. Lindbergh. Ireland is no longer much of a stick with which to belabor Britain.'

"Undoubtedly Professor Maynard is aware that President Roosevelt was re-elected on the strength of his promise to keep his country out of the war. Had he told the people that his intention was to take them step by step to actual participation in the present conflict, and that they would be called upon to make stupendous sacrifices in blood and treasure, most assuredly he would not have been re-elected.

"Now most of the arguments used by Messrs. Wheeler and Lindbergh bear down upon Mr. Roosevelt's pre-election pledge. As isolationists they are helping him to keep it. As interventionists, they would be urging him to break it.

"There is the crux, in a nutshell, as it were. Both Wheeler and Lindbergh have been sticking to facts. So far no one has been able to refute their arguments. Their opponents have not even tried to do so. All they did was to call "nawsty" names and by the pressure of monopolistic prerogative as far as they could, deny them the exercise of one of the "four freedoms" — freedom of speech

* * *

"Perhaps Professor Maynard could tell us who has given who the power to do such a thing. We know, just the same, that he will not. Sometimes nobody wants to talk about what everybody knows! . . .

"We think the most objectionable and at the same time the least justifiable statements contained in Professor Maynard's article were the following:

" 'The original Catholic contribution to the discussion—it is not very original and monstrously un-Catholic—is anti-Semitism. The moronic mob following Father Coughlin has come to think of Communism as a Jewish affair and of course the "international bankers" are Jewish. Father Coughlin has been repudiated time after time by responsible Catholic leaders and SOCIAL JUSTICE is not classed as a Catholic magazine. It makes no difference—millions of Americans still believe that Father Coughlin speaks for the Church.'

"There is an implication in the foregoing that Catholic isolationists are anti-Semitic, presumably because there are influential Jews among the interventionists. There are also members of their own hierarchy and clergy similarly placed. In fact those interested in putting the United States into a fighting war, although a small minority, are representative of all classes and creeds of the nation. The claim that the 'short-of-war' majority is 'anti' to all of them would appear to be absurd. Even members of the same family hold opposite views upon the question of intervention.

"It would be hardly fair to call Cardinal O'Connell or Archbishop Beckman anti-Catholic because they have expressed their disagreement with other prelates of the Church upon war issues.

"Before making reference to Father Coughlin and his former activities we think it should be stated that a Catholic priest cannot be anti-Semitic and at the same time remain in good standing as a pastor of souls.

"That Father Coughlin has made enemies among Catholics, Protestants, Jews and pro-British elements through his criticisms is not only well known because of published recriminations but also demonstrated by works of discrimination. None the less it would be quite easy to prove that Father Coughlin is neither anti-Catholic, anti-Protestant, anti-Semitic, or anti-British.

"Those who say that he is have so far failed to substantiate their accusations.

"To assert that the "Radio" Priest's following is a moronic mob confirms our suspicion that Professor Maynard must be thinking with Bishop Henry Wise Hobson of the Episcopal diocese of southern Ohio who recently gave some pointers on how to stimulate war psychology. He counseled: 'Don't appeal to the intellect, appeal to the emotions.' A moron, however, is one whose development has been arrested. He lacks both in mind and feeling. There is no such thing therefore as a 'moronic mob.'

"It is not true to say that Father Coughlin has been repudiated by anyone, responsible or otherwise. The meaning of the word "repudiated" explains that.

* * *

"In conclusion: Professor Maynard, to make matters worse, accuses Archbishop Beckman of using Coughlinite arguments in his Dubuque speech. Therein lies a rather ungentlemanly insinuation. He further accuses the archbishop of putting strong anti-Semitic implications into the address mentioned because he addressed himself to 'American Catholics and Christians in general.'

"That is about the slimmest evidence we have ever seen produced upon which to pin a serious accusation.

"As it so happened we tuned in on Archbishop Beckman's speech of July 28. We missed entirely the alleged 'implications' believing that His Excellency was addressing himself to his fellow citizens.

"In summing up, we believe that as a piece of war propaganda, Professor Maynard's article missed the mark. It was rather an appeal to the passions of those war-mongering Americans who consider the survival of the British empire essential to American safety. And why should not the Empire survive with one-half of the nations of the world in man-power and resources behind her?

"Far be it from us to find fault with those Americans who want to see Britain survive. Also far be it from us to agree with those Americans who put British survival before that of their own country."

* * *

It might be well to add what the Reverend Edward Lodge Curran said of Father Coughlin on the occasion of the latter's birthday celebration at Brooklyn.

"There is one quality in the personality of Father Coughlin which we should specially honor tonight," said Fr. Curran. "We are proud of his genius. We are proud of his humanity. We are proud of his Americanism. We are proud of his priesthood. Tonight we should be particularly proud of his courage. Father Coughlin might still have been on the airways, had he chosen to succumb to the political prudence of weaklings.

"Father Coughlin might have been welcomed into the society of the high and mighty, had he chosen to compromise and surrender.

"But Father Coughlin possesses that courage which every man must possess who desires to lead the people into the promised land of Social Justice and National Peace and Christian Civilization.

"He has the courage to speak out, when eloquence is necessary. He has the courage to be silent, when silence is necessary. He has the courage to accept temporary defeat, so that some day he may enjoy eternal victory.

"Father Coughlin has refused to surrender his soul to the time-serving politicians and the plutocratic oligarchy and the foreign psychophants who are only temporarily in control of our American destiny.

"He knows how little they care for Social Justice or National Peace or Christian Civilization.

"He knows how they talk of democracy to hide the dictatorship they would impose upon the American people.

"He knows how they were dedicated to the philosophy of destruction, the destruction of harvests in the fields and of cattle in the fold

"He knows how today they have adopted the economic philosophy of production, only to squander the fruits of American production abroad, only to bankrupt American households beneath an avalanche of taxes, only to forge foreign entangling alliances with European nations, contrary to the peace and prosperity of the citizens of the United States of America.

"Father Coughlin would not sell his birthright as a Christian leader for their mess of pagan pottage. In possession of power and not of truth, his enemies reached out to silence his voice because they could not silence his soul."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Freedom of Press is Nazified

WHAT we feared regarding the freedom of the press is about to happen.

It will be harder to find freedom of the press during the "emergency" that it will be to find ice cubes in Satan's kitchen.

Washington press bureaus and wire services have already been raided. By dangling slap-happy sums of lend-lease money before the eyes of "let's-get-ours" newsmen, the New Deal Government is achieving its purpose of getting rid of freedom by indirection.

Although the Government now employs 1,400 newspaper men, stenographers and clerks in nine central bureaus, it is estimated that these agencies will spend at least $10-million during the coming fiscal year to propagandize the American public; to spread the philosophy of New Deal rightism and everything else leftism.

Colonel Wm. M. Donovan's office of Co-ordinator of Information, Nelson Rockefeller's office of Co-ordinator of Inter-American Affairs, the press section of Selective Service, the Office of Emergency Management, and the Office of Facts and Figures, the recently created bureau headed by Archibald MacLeish—these will be the channels through which the $10-million will be expended to propagandize the American public and write the news for the American press.

News-Week magazine commenting on this onslaught against freedom and Government control of news says:

"Probably the worst plunderer of Capital reporters is the information division of the OEM, directed by Robert W. Horton, former Washington correspondent for the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance. Starting early in the publicity parade to assemble its staff of 220, the OEM enjoyed choice pickings in corralling its Washington reporters. Its grabs included Max B. Boyd of the AP, Bruce Catton of N.E.A., Lester Finnegan and George McMillan of the *Washington Daily News,* John Moutoux and Herbert Little of the Scripps-Howard Newspaper Alliance, Osgood Nichols of the *Washington Post,* Leigh Plummer and Tom W. Wilson of the *Wall Street Journal,* and Ronald Van Tine of U.P.

"The Donovan committee, whose staff numbers more than 300, has the following Washington newspapermen on its payroll: H. H. Frank, a feature writer for *Collier's* magazine and previously head of the Overseas News Agency bureau, Lee Rashall of I.N.S., M. Bainbridge Hayden of A.P., Hobard Montee of U.P., George Bookman of the *Washington Post,* and Porter McKeever, correspondent for several newspapers in the Dakotas and Carolinas. The Donovan committee has also snapped up other ace newsmen: Irving B. Pflaum, foreign editor of the *Chicago Times,* heads its radio news division in Washington; Percy Winner of I.N.S. is now European radio manager in London; and in its New York office a staff of more than 50 under Joseph Barnes, foreign editor of the *New York Herald Tribune,* includes Ed Stanley, former A.P. news photo editor, Wallace Deuel, Berlin correspondent of the *Chicago Daily News,* Edmund Taylor, Paris correspondent of the *Chicago Tribune,* and Ed Johnson, foreign news editor of C.B.S.

"The Rockefeller office has snatched up at least six: Harry W. Frantz and Thomas A. Dozier of U.P., Robert McGill of I.N.S., Forest Hall of the *United States News,* Martha Dalrymple of *Fortune* Magazine, and Ruby Black, correspondent for Midwestern newspapers.

"In the Navy Department's press relations division are Lt. Comdr. Fred Storm of U.P., Lt. A. A. Allen of the *Washington Post,* Ensign F. W. Rounds of the *United States News,* and Ensign A. A. Hoehling of the *Washington Star.* (Recently, one Government draftee, Lt. Comdr. Hal O'Flaherty, was relieved of his duties as assistant to the director of the Navy public-relations office to resume his job as managing editor of the *Chicago Daily News.*) In the Army public-relations division are Capt. Joseph Edgerton and Lt. George Haddock of the *Washington Star,* and John P. Gowan of the Tri-State News Service.

* * *

There are no newspapers in America able to compete against this flood of propaganda operated and directed by the New Deal through the instrumentality of your tax money.

We have come to the day when we are paying a Government agency to tell us that wrong is right.

Co-ordinated with all this is an article appearing in the *Jewish Criterion* of November 7th. Reference is made to Dr. L. M. Birkhead, Jewish front man in their private "F.B.I." service. Birkhead advised all democratic groups to join forces to counteract Nazis under the America First banner. Birkhead is in favor of setting up a minister of propaganda in this country with billions—not millions—to support it on an international front with which to propagandize our democratic way of life.

Ordinarily, Birkhead knows what he is talking about in so far as he reflects the plots and plans of international Jewry. He once served as side-car man for the bubble dancer, Sally Rand. He now serves as trial balloonist for the Jews.

The odds are ten to one that Birkhead and his group win the day.

They have won every battle so far. They are determined to win the war.

Star Spangled Banner

IN READING the *New York Daily News* for November 6th, we were shocked. In the column "Broadway" by Danton Walker, there appeared the following note:

" . . . Stravinsky, the Russian composer who recently became a naturalized citizen (according to Sidney Skolsky) is now rewriting 'The Star-Spangled Banner.' Soviet style?"

Our comment is, "Why not?"

Is not Mr. Roosevelt streamlining his New Deal Government according to Soviet pattern?

Has not Mr. Roosevelt given the greatest Christmas gift on record to his dear pal, bloody Joe?

Let us not be shocked at anything appearing in the publicity columns today. *"The old order changeth, giving place to new."*

The Fable of the Magic Mortgage

ONCE UPON a time two boys went to a little school in the country. Tom Banks was quick witted and especially smart at arithmetic; Hiram Clay had to study long and hard to learn anything at all.

Hiram became a plain dirt farmer. He worked long hours and he worked hard and, after many years, he secured a clear title to 80 acres of so-so land worth perhaps $5,000 with buildings and stock and machinery. He also had a family, some grown and some growing. Then sickness and accident and rain and wind hauled him down to the point where he owed $2,000 to dozens of people, merchants, doctors, and neighbors.

Tom Banks entered the local bank and, after many years, became its owner. Tom had the satisfaction of advertising deposits of $400,000.

Hiram often read these advertisements and he thought, "Folks around here have saved money and put it in Tom's bank. The big city banks must have a lot of money on deposit, too. It is there to be loaned out at interest to people like me. I'll *borrow some and get my debts straightened out!*"

So Hiram visited Tom Banks. Banks filled out a crackling sheet of paper called a "mortgage" and Tom and his wife signed it in the presence of witnesses.

Then Banks took the mortgage into a side room and laid it on a ledger and mumbled over it backwards, paragraphs 5 and 6 of Section VIII, Article I, of the *Constitution* of the United States of America. Then he made magic gestures over the ledger with a pen.

He reappeared before Hiram Clay and presented him with a deposit book and a checkbook. The deposit book showed a $2,000 deposit for Hiram. Of course, there was a withdrawal of $100 by the bank, a service charge, leaving Hiram with $1,900 though he would pay interest on $2,000.

Now, Hiram believed that the deposits of the bank would read: $400,000 minus $2,000 or $398,000. Hiram believed that he had borrowed from his neighbors and from big city depositors through the agency of the little farmtown bank.

Hiram did not know that Tom Banks, by swinging his pen over the ledger, had made the "deposits" not $398,000 but $402,000!

The $2,000 which Hiram Clay wished to borrow was thus made . . . out of his own mortgage. Hiram thought he borrowed but he did not borrow at all. He deposited a $2,000 mortgage and paid $100 and 6 per cent interest for the privilege!

If Hiram Clay had printed $2,000 worth of money he would be a counterfeiter, a criminal. Rightly so, for two wrongs do not make a right.

But Tom Banks and his banker fraternity from little towns to international combines, are honored men and prosperous!

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Monsignor Jackman

MONSIGNOR Jackman of Holy Rood, Watford, Herts, England, keeps up his correspondence with the editor. This week there arrived his *"Holy Roodlets."* Always delightful, always informative, always spiritual, the Monsignor writes about "The New Order" — a little sermonette planned for priests. He says:

"Everybody's New Order seems to be the vision of a very rosy thing that awaits us at the exit of a pretty ugly and dark alley; but will it be so rosy ecclesiastically? The Russian (i.e. Soviet) attempts towards a New Order are exceedingly interesting, as far as priests are concerned. For in Russia we find that the priests who have not been liquidated or handed a ticket to Siberia, have been asked to cultivate their own allotment and earn their own living.

"Now this is a very arresting prospect, and we are wondering whether we priests in England would not be wise in forestalling this possible feature of the New Order by trying a bit of personal cultivation this very day. After all, planting potatoes and cabbages is far healthier than having one's head severed from one's neck, however much the severance may beautify the New Order; and incidentally, as we so often preach the return to the land, it might be a good thing for us to show at last how it is done.

"The New Order would not be such a fearsome thing, if every parish could enjoy the daily sight of Father Hopkins, trudging in his trench boots, with a spade on his shoulder and a pipe in his mouth, to his field, there to rear the wherewithal for his dinner and supper—a glorious realization of the dignity of labour at the hands of the holiest in the land. Don't tell me that Father Hopkins would have to neglect his accounts, for there would be few accounts to keep, and possibly no collections to make, if Father Hopkins could provide for himself: or, he could let the faithful keep his accounts while he keeps their Faith.

"And now, here is a bit of that New Order: 'The first public Mass Smolensk could remember in the last 21 years was said in the Cathedral. I saw some hundreds of worshippers, some of their eyes dim as they heard a stone mason read the Mass. That is, he had been a stone mason under Soviet rule; under the Czar, he had been a priest. Yesterday, this man, Serge Iwano Luzkyn, laid aside his trowel and resumed the robes of his priesthood.' Exactly as St. Paul did and used to pride in doing.. (*Cf. Acts XX, 34; I Cor. ix, 12; II Thes. iv, 8*)."

* * *

Monsignor Jackman, let us remind you, is an Englishman holding one of the high posts in English Church life. Interventionists in America will be surprised to read what he has to say under the caption of *"Increase and Multiply."* Here are his words:

"In an interview with a *Daily Mail* correspondent, the Bishop of Chelmsford gave a healthy view about full cradles and empty garages, about sound youngsters trained by their brothers and sisters instead of selfish little single animals worshipped and coddled by their fond parents. Unfortunately the *Daily Mail* nullified the good effects of this bit of common sense by publishing a sheaf of letters from sterile parents on the advantage of big garages and small bungalows, devised for the sterility of married people and the depopulation of the country. Were letters to the contrary consigned to the waste paper basket?

"But take the case of Canada and Australia; if we cannot populate them, why should our neighbors not do it for us? After all, possession is based on occupancy, so much so that there is no possession, if there is no occupancy. Then why should Japan not be justified in trying to take Australia, if she can?

"If modern civilization makes the observance of the natural law impossible to the individual, maybe there will be no individual responsibility; but there always remains a collective responsibility, which is inexorably punished by the natural law.

"If a race decays and fails to fill its country, nature always provides another race ready to oblige."

* * *

Monsignor Jackman knows the *London Weekly Review* and its editors. It appears that the *Weekly Review* criticized the Monsignor's feeding children at the local church. Here is how the Very Reverend prelate wrote on that point:

"It has been objected in the *Weekly Review* that every school meal is an encouragement offered to Naziism—the principle of treating human beings like cattle with breeding pens in place of homes, and feeding troughs in place of the family kitchen. There would be a good deal in the object, if the choice lay between the school and the home, but such is not the alternative. It rather lies, for the children, between a meal and no meal, between an empty stomach and a full stomach. In some districts they would be left with no meal at all, except a crust of bread. And so it is only common decency to let them have a good feed at school, principles or no principles.

"In their case, there is not the least sacrifice of home or home principles implied, since the question of home does not arise: and to let them suffer on the principle of home would not be calculated to make them love it.

"As many as 170 at present sit down to eat at Holy Rood every day. And the kitchen is there to use for a thousand and more people in an emergency. There is more in these arrangements than meets even the eagle eye of the *Weekly Review*."

The London Weekly Review

THE EDITOR of the *London Weekly Review* (Oct. 9) entertains the opinion that SOCIAL JUSTICE is violently anti-English.

Nothing can be further from the truth. This National Magazine most definitely is not anti-English. It is pro-English. In fact, it is pro all people.

However, SOCIAL JUSTICE is anti-British. There is a vast distinction between British and English—almost as much as there is between being American and New Dealer.

We recognize that the English people have suffered most heinously from their British government. It was a form of government by which one group holding different shades of opinion managed to keep themselves in power under the banner either of conservative party or labor party or liberal party.

The British government exploited the coal miners of Wales, the ship builders of Edinburgh, the factory workers of Manchester, of Coventry and other centers. Nowhere in the English speaking world were the sons and daughters of God treated so slavishly as in English industry.

Meanwhile, the Bank of England—far more appropriately called the international bank of Great Britain—dominated the commercial activities of the empire, exploited not only the Englishman but the Indian, the Canadian, the New Zealander, and the South Africander; and huge profits sucked from the exploited of all lands fell into the rapacious purses of the chosen few.

The trouble with the editors of the *Weekly Review* is that they are too close to his picture to see it. They forget how the international bankers of London bought and paid for the rearmament of Germany, just as many Americans forget that certain international bankers in our country bought and paid for the Bolshevik revolution of 1917.

It is our honest hope that the English people will upset the present British government, thereby obtaining freedom from the control and exploitation now held in the hands of financial overlords.

Alfred Noyes—English Poet

MR. ALFRED NOYES, noted English poet, is visiting America. In his opinion, the world is suffering an intellectual collapse; that it has been doing so for the past 25 years.

Because poetry is chiefly his field, he spoke rather dogmatically in stating that in our day poetry is warped and art is dying.

"The only men who are doing anything today," he said "are those with religion. Two of the very few men in America—or anywhere — today who are capable of connected thought about the whole state of affairs are right here at the University of Chicago.

"Mortimer Adler and the president, Robert Hutchins. That's because they have a sense of the past and origins and roots. They have what I would call a background of Christendom, the perennial philosophy that comes right down from Plato to the present day.

"Everything today is so wrong, so warped," he added in quick explanation. "Only the people who have a religion seem to have retained the power to think rationally. They put first things first. With all others a cloud of hydrogen comes first."

The intellectual collapse is due to the rejection of the revelations of God.

The world has not rejected God, save in Soviet Russia. We emphasize, however, that it has rejected the revelations made by God.

More specifically, it has rejected the Word of God. And the Word of God is the Word-Made-Flesh, Jesus Christ.

The words of the Word-Made-Flesh are found in His gospel and in the traditions of the Church which He founded.

Negatively, we observe that politicians too often regard the revelations of God as poetry to be read from a pulpit on Sunday but poor prose to be practiced in the office on Monday.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

A Jewish Rabbi Describes LaGuardia

FROM the *Jewish Examiner* (Oct. 31) we lift the following biographical sketch written by Rabbi Philip R. Alstat:

"On seeing New York's mayor, Fiorello H. LaGuardia, or reading his name in print for the first time one would ordinarily not suspect that he was of Jewish origin. Nevertheless this fact has been established by documentary evidence and confirmed by himself and his Jewish relatives abroad.

"His mother was 100 per cent Jewish. The transcript of his parents' marriage certificate which was filed in the municipal archives of Foggia, Italy (his father's birthplace), leaves no doubt about it. In that document it is officially recorded that 'Achille Luigi Carlo LaGuardia, of no religious affiliation, was married in Trieste on June 6, 1880, to Irene Coen, the daughter of Isaaco Coen (Isaac Cohen) and Fioretta Luzzatto, of the Israelitish religion.' (Luzzatto is also a well known Italian-Jewish name.)

"His father was an Italian musician who had immigrated to the United States where he eventually became the military bandmaster at the army post in Whipple, Arizona. During one of his vacations, while visiting the city of Trieste, he met and successfully wooed the pretty Italian Jewess, Irene Coen. She agreed to marry him only civilly, specifying that she must always remain free to adhere to her own faith. They returned to the United States where they raised a family of three children—two sons, Fiorello and Ricardo, and a daughter, Gemma. For some unknown reason, though the mother was Jewish and the father of no religious faith, the three children were reared in the Evangelical Church. (Today Fiorello, too, like his father, has no religious affiliation.)

"Subsequently Gemma, a cultured woman and a teacher of languages, returned to Judaism of her own accord and married Hermann Glick, a Jew, who is employed as the foreign correspondent of the Hungarian General Credit Bank at Budapest. Ever since then she has lived a religious Jewish life, kept a kosher home and has been an active social worker in the Jewish community, especially in providing for needy German-Jewish refugees.

"Moreover, according to an interview with Mrs. Glick, the Mayor and she are more than half Jewish, because in their father's family there is a tradition that the LaGuardias originally came to Italy from Spain and that they are descended of Spanish Jews whom the Medieval Inquisition had terrorized into adopting Christianity. Perhaps that was partly why the elder LaGuardia was so very fond of Jewish liturgical music and would frequently attend synagogue services to enjoy it; or why he encouraged the children, though raised in the Evangelical faith, to accompany their mother to synagogue services and even to learn to read Hebrew prayers."

F. D. R. Says 'Not in Vain'

THE ARMISTICE Day speech delivered by President Roosevelt was a pitiful attempt to white-wash the blackened ruins resulting from World War I.

The President, among other things, informed us that our boys "did not die in vain."

Let us see: The advertised purpose of our getting into World War I was to "save the world for democracy" and to fight "a war to end wars."

We achieved a failure never paralleled in the history of the world; for we made Europe safe for Lenin and for Bolshevism; the British Empire safe for the international bankers; and depression safe for the people of the United States.

Add to these "victories" the consequences which flowed from them. For example, the untold millions who sacrificed their lives in Russia for the new kind of democracy; and the iniquitous *Peace Treaty of Versailles,* which, according to Clemenceau, was good for many more wars.

So, our boys did not die in vain, Mr. Roosevelt. They were credulous boys and we were a credulous people to believe your predecessor in office who sought re-election to the presidency on the advertised deceit of "he kept us out of war."

After his return from Versailles, Mr. Wilson knew what an abject failure both he and his fourteen points had proven to be. Motivated by a flash of honesty and frankness, he told the American people that World War I was not fought to make the world safe for democracy; not waged to end all wars; but for commercial greed and empire!

Of course, our deluded boys did not die in vain, if their deaths are measured by the profit the imperialists gained both at home and abroad.

It is high time our public officials tell the truth to the American people.

Walsh Knows Navy

GEORGE ROTHWELL BROWN, in his syndicated column, asks his readers to weigh well the statement recently made by Senator Walsh that our Navy is not ready for Mr. Roosevelt's shooting war — "everywhere in the world."

Said Mr. Brown:

"When Senator David I. Walsh of Massachusetts finds it necessary to issue a warning to his fellow countrymen, that the American Navy is not ready for a shooting war in foreign seas, the time has come for those fellow countrymen of his to sit up and take notice.

"When upon the day following the issuance of this warning, Senator Walsh, in a formal statement, declares that the President has now left no doubt of his purpose to wage war against the Axis powers, there should be no underestimating of these solemn words.

"The first statement by the Senator preceded the belligerent address of Mr. Roosevelt on the night of October 27; the second was made on the morning after the delivery of that truculent tirade, in which the President virtually served notice that he had declared all out war on Hitler.

"Senator Walsh happens to be one of the foremost authorities on the United States Navy in this country. No man is better informed of what our Navy is today, and as to the purpose for which it was designed and created.

"As chairman of the Senate Naval Affairs Committee, Senator Walsh has long been one of the principal spokesmen for the Navy at the Capitol.

"You may take it, that for a long period of years he has accurately reflected in his public utterances the soundest naval opinion. He has spoken for the Navy—when the Navy could not speak for itself.

"Navy officers are subordinates of the Commander in Chief. It is not in human nature to expect them to make public statements destructive of the policy as laid down by the Commander in Chief. But upon Senator Walsh rests no such inhibitions.

"It so happens that Senator Walsh is a distinguished member of the party of which Mr. Roosevelt is the political head. He is no Republican critic. He is a Democrat.

"Hence Senator Walsh's statement that the Navy is not ready for a shooting war in foreign seas is without political bias or prejudice. Every one reasonably familiar with legislation for the Navy over a recent period of years knows that Senator Walsh is absolutely right.

"This does not mean that the American Navy, ship for ship, gun for gun and man for man is not a first class fighting fleet. It is all of that, perhaps the finest Navy in the world, and the best this nation has ever possessed.

"What Senator Walsh means is that this splendid Navy of ours was designed and and built for defense, and not for attack in far off seas.

"This has been the steadfast policy of Congress with respect of the Navy."

The C. I. O. Convention

(Continued from Page 7)

from the American Labor Party because it does not wish to provide a cloak of respectability for Communist elements in the party. This is the party that polled 434,297 votes for Mayor LaGuardia in the recent municipal election, thereby providing the margin which assured his re-election. It is the same party now yelling for revolution.

The straw that broke David Dubinsky's back, according to I.L.G.W.U., occurred when it became known that Representative Vito Marcantonio, leader of the communistic wing of the labor party, spent election night with the Mayor while right wing leaders sought vainly to get in touch with him.

The point is that David Dubinsky is not going along with any outright Communist labor movement. More power to him.

2. The real leaders of labor and the real lovers of honest capitalism are anxiously awaiting the re-appearance of those orators and pleaders who, from pulpit and platform, urged laboring men to join the C.I.O. some years ago.

Where are they in this crisis when it appears that radical leadership, as Father Coughlin predicted, has taken over a great part of the C.I.O.?

These gentlemen are needed to help Philip Murray even though it costs them the questionable approval of certain agitators in the ranks of labor.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

SOCIAL JUSTICE aims to make this page a free forum and readers' opinions are invited. Naturally the views expressed are not always those of this magazine. We cannot guarantee that contributions sent SOCIAL JUSTICE can be returned to the writers. Letters not signed with the writer's name and address cannot be considered, although the name will not necessarily be used. We reserve the right to publish all letters received unless contrary instruction is specifically given.

Hm, Could Be!

TO THE EDITOR:

Dr. Will Durant, speaking in Boston before the Middlesex County Teachers Association, suggested that the real Hess story might be somewhat as follows:

A man named Rudolf flew to England from Germany. He informed the British that if the Nazis were defeated, Soviet Russia would be supreme on the continent, and that the upsurge of victorious Communism would threaten England itself and Britain's world possessions.

Hess proposed that if Britain would refrain from an effective bombing of Germany while the Nazis were fighting in Russia, the Nazis in turn would cease bombing England.

After the power of Communism is broken, with this assistance of the British leaders, the Nazis, then in full control of Europe and possessed of the vast resources of European Russia, would call off the invasion of England, and would leave Britain its navy and all its present colonies.

Dr. Durant said he was "banking on the British diplomats" to come out on top in dealing with the diplomats of any other nation. A double-crosser can be beaten only by a triple-crosser, he said.

Is the professed British friendship for the Soviet in its struggle against Naziism only a gigantic bluff?

Is it possible that the "colossal liar" Hitler and the "stupendous liar" Stalin and the "inaccurate" Mr. Roosevelt are all of them to be put to shame by the champions of perfidious British diplomacy?

Under how many layers of brightly colored lies may we hope to find the truth?

—V.J.B.

Somerville, Massachusetts.

Queer People

TO THE EDITOR:

Americans are a very queer people.

We believe it our duty to finance and fight wars all over the world. Our hearts cry with big tears for the hungry peoples of other lands, while American people starve and freeze in our own block!

We condemn the dictators of Europe, and sing and make speeches about our American "democracy," when ours is already almost as much a dictatorship as any regime in Europe.

We say that we are fighting for "democracy," and at the same time we slap down other countries which are fighting to preserve their democracy.

We pretend to condemn Communism, yet we feel it is our duty to save a Communistic bloody dictatorship in order to "save" our own country.

We laughed at the people of Germany and Russia because they so blindly follow their dictator, yet we in the U.S.A. are ready to ostracize anybody who does not "stand by" the President as he leaps from one whimsical position to another.

—Mrs. M.A.

Detroit, Michigan.

W. W. Also a Historian

TO THE EDITOR:

The other day I opened a volume entitled, *"History of the American People,"* by Woodrow Wilson.

To one who had learned history the old way, besides being an admirer of President Wilson, it was a distinct shock.

For instance, he states that the French and Indian war was not fought for the benefit of Britain but in the interest of the Colonists. As for the cause of the American Colonists in the Revolution, he doesn't give it a leg to stand on.

I am sorry I didn't read this history previous to World War No. 1.

—F.A.S.

Putnam, Connecticut.

By Whose Power? Beelzebub's?

TO THE EDITOR:

The comments of Archbishop McNicholas about aid to Communist Russia and, Msgr. Sheen's opinion about Hitler being "possessed" by the devil, have given aid and new comfort to the worst and most diabolical enemy of the Catholic Church, namely, atheistic Communism, and new strength to the gold-greedy war mongers.

Some of our leaders have been terribly bothered about Hitler's background — a paper-hanger, a painter, or whatever he was. At least, he seems to have earned an honest living at his trade; he was not a criminal and a bank robber.

Does Msgr. Sheen think that Stalin will fight Satan? I thought our Lord settled the question about Beelzebub casting out devils, 2,000 years ago.

What should matter more to Msgr. Sheen, and every other American, is the utter madness of Roosevelt and the set-up riding high, wide and impudently in Washington, D. C.; and how our own elected politicians have linked up with the internationalists for the complete and outright betrayal of this nation!

Should any educated man talk of a war of defense for America against Germany 4,000 miles away, with our own land seething with Communist activists, and official Washington infested with admitted Communists in key positions surrounding the Chief Executive of the Republic?

Should an educated man talk of war of defense for the Russian people? Since when have the Russian people any rights that they wish to defend?

—A.M.G.

Lawrenceville, Illinois.

How About the Security?

TO THE EDITOR:

On August 1, 1941, according to the *World Statistician,* a monthly finance pamphlet, England had to her credit in cash, stocks and bonds, bullion and other holdings (real estate not included) more than $90-billion.

In view of this fact—why are the American people forced to make sacrifices to pay Britain's bills?

If our New Deal administration were honorable and honest with the American people, in my opinion, these holdings should be turned over to the United States until the date of establishing settlement.

Minneapolis, Minnesota. —A.M.S.

'What's My Name?'

TO THE EDITOR:

While attempting to put a little polish on my rather tarnished memory of history, I came upon the following descriptive passages. The historian, in writing of a certain fair-haired boy, remarks:

"He grew up full of prejudices, fostered and pampered by women and servants. He early became greatly interested in agriculture, and soon gained and enjoyed the title of "gentleman farmer." He acquired an enormous over-estimation of his own wisdom and rectitude, and could appreciate no point of view other than his own, treating with rudeness, vindictiveness and even treachery any who presumed to differ with him.

"Patriotic and high-minded statesmen who were assertive and independent, he kept out of office, while those who did his bidding, however incompetent or even dissolute, were given high places in his confidence and favor.

"Spending vast sums in the bestowal of bribes and pensions, he was ever in debt, and patronage was lavishly employed in maintaining a strong body of supporters in the nation's legislature. Thus, he bent all his energies to systematically impose his will upon the nation.

"It is said that his mother had much to do in the shaping of these characteristics, ceaselessly drilling him in the traditions of petty rule and exhorting him ever to 'Be a King.'

"Thus, in place of the much-heralded reform, official corruption grew apace and swelled the national debt to undreamed-of proportions, and also made serious encroachments upon the liberties of the people."

No, my friends, the above is not what you're thinking right now. It is one historian's word picture of George the Third of England; and, in all charity, this historian added that our friend, George, was subject to a mental disorder of a nature greatly aggravated by increasing power.

Now, my own ancestors decided to not "Let George do it" anymore; and they ran his red-coats back to their tight little isle. It was an excellent idea, and someone has said that history repeats.

Minneapolis, Minnesota. —B.R.D.

Condemned to Middle Class Future Fate for Criminals

TO THE EDITOR:

Let us suppose for a moment that with the help of the movies, radio and controlled press, fools multiplied to such a degree that the "12-year plan" became a great success and its methods were adopted by our courts.

Let us go in spirit to one of these court sessions. The first case on the docket is called. The defendant is accused of embezzlement but his lawyer objects bitterly to this ugly word and pictures his client as a great "liberal and humanitarian."

In case No. 2 the defendant, let us say, is charged with manslaughter. His lawyer also objects and pictures his client as one who is so filled with "sympathy for the democracies" (to borrow from a St. Louis editorial) that he could no longer refrain from forcing his "way of life" on others even though extremes were necessary.

The elderly judge, a product of the horse and buggy days, finds both men guilty, whereupon the lawyers again object and accuse the judge of being anti-Semitic and of giving aid and comfort to the Reich and other enemies of "our way of life."

The judge, unmoved, solemnly sentences the defendants to pay their debt to society. Since business men and property owners have long since been penalized as if they were criminals, he condemns the first defendant to become sole owner of six single flats for life; and the second is sentenced to become president and largest stockholder of a motor corporation.

Now, all this may sound like a lot of foolishness; but think a moment, is it any more foolish than the New Deal's domestic policy?

It is not quite as foolish as our foreign policy of giving away money to foreign countries so that they may buy from us, and then asking our people to fight to save our foreign trade which is already a loss to the taxpayers.

—A.M.

St. Louis, Missouri.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Letters

Vatican City Folks Just 'Out of Luck'

TO THE EDITOR:

Perhaps you already know, but for what it is worth here is "my day."

For the past several weeks I have read in several Catholic weeklies that Vatican City had representatives in Lisbon seeking food supplies. Yesterday, I read in the *N. Y. Times* that Enrico Galeazzi had left by plane for New York on the same mission.

It occurred to me that I should like to send by airmail some small luxury, such as a pound of pulverized whole milk, a small box of chocolate bars or cigarettes. I realized that the rate would be high and the amount I could afford to send would not be a drop in the bucket. Still, as a Christian, I felt that I would like to do this.

The United States Postoffice sent me to the British Consul! There, the English attendant looked up the pros and cons. I had asked her only if I might send a carton of cigarettes to Pope Pius XII, Vatican City.

Her answer was that Vatican City is listed as a "neutral" State so in order to send the carton of smokes I should fill out a blank that would be provided by the British Consul. This then would go to Washington, D. C. and then on to London. If O.K.'d there I would be sent a sticker which I might attach to the carton which would then be permitted to go airmail from the U.S.A. to Vatican City.

I asked the young woman how about just taking my chances without all the red tape; and she said it would be "confiscated by the British blockade!"

I think this is a most outrageous situation! Any mouthing of the "freedom of the seas" is an utter mockery. Certainly, every Catholic Christian in the U.S.A. should protest.

You cannot send a cake of chocolate to the Holy Father, the reining head of Christianity, without getting permission from New Deal Washington, and the British in London; and, what's worse, waiting for this permission so long that most probably there will be some new official view about Christ!

—M.A.C.

San Francisco, California.

Until the Harvest

TO THE EDITOR:

May I put at rest the scruples of these conscientious Catholics who fear to make themselves part of the awful sin of war by paying taxes for armaments, by reminding them that Almighty God lets the sunshine and rain descend upon the sinful as well as the good, seeming to condone the present evil as it grows beside the virtuous in every situation.

Then, too, Jesus Christ told the farmers to let the cockle grow beside the wheat for fear of losing the precious good involved in the matter.

So, those of us who fear to become part of the evil by paying taxes that seemingly help it along, should remember that the farmers probably had to pay the water bill to irrigate the cockle.

The conscientious scruples of present-day Christians are taken care of in this parable of the wheat and the tares.

San Diego, California. —C.A.C.

Writing On the Wall

TO THE EDITOR:

Most of us, I think, assumed that the "V" was for Victory, but a postcard from England shows that there may be more than meets the eye to this "V" business.

The card shows the second and third fingers (only) extended and spread to form a "V" and the legend "Mene Tekel" with a reference to the *Book of Daniel* (Chapter V) v v v v v.

This procession of V's forced me to get out my Bible and there I found the meaning of their V. Briefly, Belshazar, a Gentile, whose father had conquered the Jews, was terrified at a banquet to see the fingers of a man's hand ("V") write his doom upon the wall.

That night the king was killed by the Medes, other Gentiles. The Chosen People, seeing this as a sign from God that He would deliver them, have used this symbol as their sign of eventual victory through the centuries ever since.

Could the Jewish people today again be praying that their Gentile persecutor will be destroyed by other Gentile armies?

We cannot blame them for hoping, but in Heaven's name do they think that they can enlist all of us in their private "V" campaigns?

Chicago, Illinois. —J.W.M.

Priests' Poll Is Target

TO THE EDITOR:

The interventionists have already embarked on a program to destroy the value of the recent poll of Catholic clergy. They have resurrected ghost arguments that were killed by the Russo-German alliance, but given new life by the Anglo-American-Soviet alliance.

Radical and "liberal" non-Catholic clergymen, allied with Communists and Communist organizations, now accuse the Catholic clergy of the country of being "fascist" in mind and sympathy.

Because a majority of the Catholic priesthood has registered its protest against America's participation in the war, the McConnels, the Wards, the Niebuhrs will now accuse priests of "sympathy and co-operation with Naziism."

Communist clerics and political pulpiteers are already preparing to launch this campaign of villification with a view to pointing out that Catholics are "unpatriotic" and non-interventionist, because they follow instructions of the Sovereign Pontiff.

The campaign, we hear, is to be launched by the publication of an article analyzing the priests' poll, written by a well-known "leftist and liberal divine" and appearing in a recognized "liberal" magazine.

Because this eminent leftist theologian does not recognize religious dogma and moral law, his attack against the Catholic clergy will, of course, not take into consideration the principles of a just and moral war, nor the ethics of rendering aid to a nation professing and practicing a system of irreligion and immorality, which the Sovereign Pontiff has condemned as intrinsically evil.

—J.W.C.

New York City, N. Y.

Do We Deserve to Win the War?

TO THE EDITOR:

Until I happened to read a list recently of the various organizations and charities who are sending "bundles" here and there, and financing this foreign country and that, I did not realize what "saps" we really are.

If Uncle Sam were to forget where he put his pocketbook, we might have peace by Christmas.

I do not care what became of Miss America of 1929, or Technocracy, or Peek-a-boo blouses, or straight-front forms, or Ma Perkins' sofa, or who has Mona Lisa, at present, but I would like to know where the one-third ill-fed, ill-clad and ill-housed (that we heard so much about before election day) have found Utopia.

If we get into this war, and God is always on the side of Right, I am not at all sure that we will—or will deserve to—win.

—J.B.K.

Beaver Falls, Pa.

'Anti-Defamation'

TO THE EDITOR:

B'nai B'rith, the anti-Christian and pro-red Jewish secret society, spends millions of dollars yearly in support of its nation-wide spy-and-smear ring, known as the *"Anti-Defamation League,"* to bulldoze anyone who dares to criticize Jews or differ with them on public questions.

Many a decent patriotic Christian American has been smeared and deprived of free speech, and otherwise threatened with reprisals, by B'nai B'rith commissars.

Recently, a Chicago minister who was adjudged "guilty" by them of reading a Bible account of Christ's crucifixion on the radio, was visited by a committee of Jews and warned that, if he persisted in such "anti-Semitic readings" from the *New Testament*, "we will put you off the air, like we did a Grand Rapids minister."

In view of which, isn't it about time that a Christian anti-defamation league got on the job? Otherwise, it will not be long until Christians caught entering a Catholic or Protestant church, or having a copy of the *Gospels* in their possession, may be arrested and jailed for anti-Semitic subversion.

Even now, B'nai B'rith brands anyone who opposes Marxism and Britishism as a "Nazi rat" and "anti-Semitic."

These Jewish leaders are backing a bill in Congress whereby anything displeasing to certain Jewish overlords of war and revolution will be punishable as a felony—just as it now is in Communist Russia.

—A.F.S.

Philadelphia, Pa.

Judge Biased and Jury Packed

—*From the Chicago Tribune*

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Comment

Promises to Finland

THE request of the Soviet Russian government that Great Britain declare war on Roumania, Hungary and Finland has apparently detonated a bomb in the circles which control British war policy.

The Finnish government has officially announced that the nation did not even receive the Soviet peace offer which, according to American Secretary of State Cordell Hull was transmitted to Hjalmar Procope more than two months ago.

If Finland withdraws from the war, because all her territory has been regained; and a British or American expeditionary force lands there to open up a new front, or protect our supply route to Soviet Russia, little Finland will be torn apart by the Nazi blitz and plunged into a defeat worse than the Soviet invasion.

Soviet, British and American pressure and promises of aid to Finland must remind the Finns—as it does us—of the Anglo-American pressure and promises to many other small nations now in captivity to the Nazis.

Will Finland—like Poland, Czechoslovakia, France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Norway, Jugoslavia and Greece—pay the supreme sacrifice for resisting the Nazi juggernaut with promise, pressure and pledge?

Great Britain's betrayal of Finland caused a greater stir in England than our own betrayal of Finland caused in war-mongering Washington.

In an official statement issued by the highest officials of the Finnish government an effort was made to dissociate Finland's campaign against Red Russia from the Nazi invasion. The statement averred that the Finnish army was under the control and command of Finnish officers, operated for exclusively Finnish objectives — namely, the recovery of the Finnish territory seized by the Soviet in the war of 1939-40.

Finland is not mistress of her own policy. Her internal government has been split into two groups; one calling for peace at the risk of attack from the Nazis, the other calling for continuation of the war against Russia.

Britain and America have appealed to Finland's Social Democrats to accept the armistice; for the Social Democrats are known to favor the Allies, while the military, originally trained by German officers, is known to favor the Nazis.

Page Monsignor Ryan!

REDOUBTABLE Monsignor John A. Ryan told us: "Your judgment that 'this country is drifting into Communism fast,' is utterly wrong."

The good Monsignor should note that a Communist has just been elected to a high office in New York City.

According to the *Catholic News* of New York, "The biggest indoor rally of the recent political campaign was staged not by the Republicans or the Democrats or the Fusionists or the American Labor Party, but by the Communists."

The New York Times estimated the crowd at 18,000.

It was the largest indoor rally of the campaign despite the fact that admission to others was free, and admission to the communist rally was by ticket, for which over 16,000 of the 18,000 paid. Again, the statistics are from the *Times*.

The *Catholic News* comments:

"New York Communist leaders who until the breach of the Nazi-Communist non-aggression pact in June were preaching pacificism and denouncing the European conflict as a capitalistic war, scored those of whom they do not approve, including all-out supporters of the President's foreign policy, as Nazi appeasers; demanded that the German, Vichy and other fascist representatives, be ousted from our country; and, in a resolution addressed to the President and Congress, called for the immediate establishment of a Western Front against Hitler.

"The fact that the Communists of New York can stage a bigger rally even when charging admission than the American political parties can sponsor with admission free ought to arrest the thoughtful attention of those who maintain that Communism and Communists are no problem and no danger to this nation," says the *Catholic News*.

"Communists were pacifists a few months ago because it was to the interest of Soviet Russia to have them so. They are now interventionists not because of any concern for the welfare of the United States but because they are actuated by and dictated to solely by the Russian Soviet. Let the Soviet make a separate peace with the Nazis tomorrow, or let the Soviet make common cause with the Nazis against their enemies, and the Communists will duplicate the speed of their overnight shift of June."

Motion Picture Industry Malodorous

WHEN Willie Bioff, the motion picture labor leader and convicted panderer, was sentenced recently with George E. Browne, there were more than Willie and Georgie blamed for bringing "limburger cheese" into the Federal courtroom.

During the course of the trial which proved these grafters guilty, it was brought out that the motion picture industry, through fear, played monkey business in its bookkeeping department.

Now the question comes up: "Why aren't the motion picture industry's books audited by the Government?"

Edwin A. Lahey, writing in the *Pittsburgh Press*, quotes Martin Conboy, attorney for Browne in a most uncomplimentary blast at the movie industry.

Mr. Lahey writes:

"Boy, get Wendell Wilkie on the phone. Tell him he'll have to do something about this quote by Martin Conboy, attorney for George E. Browne, the labor skate. After all, he got a pretty good fee a couple of months ago when the Senate was kicking us around.

"'God save the United States,' says Mr. Conboy, 'if the instruction, morality and destinies of the United States are in the keeping of those people who have been on the witness stand before you and have testified as the representatives of this great industry in this country'."

Mr. Conboy, who used to be United States District Attorney in New York, was making his final plea to the jury.

"This trial," continued Mr. Conboy, "has almost in a sense developed into an investigation of the motion picture industry. And a very sorry spectacle it has been.

"From the highest in the industry down to the lowest, the practices of those who are engaged in the industry are not such as to indicate that they should be in charge of one of the most important methods of acquainting the public, not only with current events, but also with what ought to be the cultural instructions of the people of this country.

"When we speak of the motion picture industry as having a great educational and moral value, as having an important effect upon the national destinies of the United States, I am forced to comment on the character of the administration of that industry in this country."

And then, the report continues, he gave the jury the "God-save-the-United States" business!

Boy, did you get hold of Mr. Willkie, yet?

Insure Your Summer

HEY, FELLOWS:

Do you want to go to camp next Summer? Wouldn't you like a couple of weeks of swimming, baseball, tennis, and the like?

You do? Well, we can fix that up for you very easily if we can have a little co-operation on your part.

Take a look around your town and spot a place where you can sell SOCIAL JUSTICE on Sunday mornings—you'll probably find one right in your own neighborhood.

Clip the blank below and we'll do the rest. We'll explain the whole set-up and the papers will be delivered right to your own door.

Never before have you had an opportunity to make so much extra money in just one morning's work. Why, in three weeks, we dare say, your original order will have tripled and if you will save the money you make—you can swim to your heart's content next Summer.

No tricks — no strings — it's the easiest way of making money that anyone ever offered you.

So, hurry and grab a pencil — and start dreaming about camp.

SOCIAL JUSTICE

Royal Oak, Michigan

Gentlemen: Please rush details of your money-making proposition:

*Name*_____

*Address*_____

*City*_____ *State*_____

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A Jewish Chronology

A THIRD instalment of the Jewish Chronology recording the history of the Jewish people from the fall of Jerusalem to our time, is presented herewith. It is reprinted from the *Jewish Encyclopedia.*

(Continued from Last Week)

C.E.

1555 Paul IV issues the bull *"Cum Nimis Absurdum."* Jews expelled from the Palatinate.

1556 Twenty-four Jews of Ancona hanged and burned by order of Paul IV.

1567 Don Joseph Nassi appointed ruler of Naxos and eleven other islands of the Grecian archipelagro. (June 15) Jews expelled from Genoese territory.

1568 Isaac Luria Levi (1534-72), cabalist, pretends to be the Messiah, son of Joseph.

1569 (Feb. 26) Bull of Pius V, *"Hebraeorum Gens,"* expels Jews from Papal States except Rome, Bologna, and Ancona.

1570 Solomon Ashkenazi sent as an envoy to Venice by Sultan Selim II.

1573 (Jan. 28) The Jew Lippold executed at Berlin; all Jews expelled from Brandenburg.

1576 Stephen Bathori allows the Jews of Poland to carry on trade without restrictions.

1582 Expulsion from Silesia.

1586 (circa). The Jews of Poland establish the Council of Four Lands; Mordecai Jafe probably its first president.

1592 (Aug. 17) Papal edict forbids Jews to admit Christians into synagogues, etc.

1593 Clement VIII expels the Jews from all the Papal States except Rome and Ancona. The first Marano settlement in Holland made at Amsterdam under Jacob Tirado.

1596 Persecution of the Persian Jews by Shah Abbas the Great.

1598 Bet Jacob synagogue consecrated at Amsterdam.

1612 Portuguese Jews granted right of residence in Hamburg.

1614 (Sept. 2) Vincent Fettmilch's attack upon the Jews of Frankfort.

1615 Jews of Worms banished.

1616 Jews return to Frankfort and Worms.

1617 (Jan. 3) *"Neue Stattgkeit"* for Frankfort makes right of domicil for Jews perpetual.

1629 (June 26) Lippman Heller forced to leave his post as rabbi in Prague.

1632 (April 20) Proselyte Nicolas Antoine burned at Geneva. (July 4) Auto da fe at Madrid.

1639 Dutch West India Company grants Jews of Guiana full religious liberty.

C.E.

1642 Six hundred Jews of Amsterdam with Isaac Aboab as hakam settle at Pernambuco.

1646 The Jews in Brazil side with the Dutch in their war with the Portuguese.

1648 The beginning of the Cossack persecutions of the Jews in Poland under Chmielnicki.

1652 Two leagues along the coast of Curacao granted to David Nassi for a Jewish colony.

1654 (July 8) Twenty-four Jews land at New Amsterdam from Brazil.

1655 (Oct.) Menasseh ben Israel goes to London to obtain from Cromwell the readmission of Jews into England.

1657 (Feb. 4) Resettlement Day; Oliver Cromwell grants Carvajal right of residence for Jews in England.

1659 (Feb. 26) Jews expelled from all the Papal States except Rome and Ancona.

1660 Jews expelled from Kiev by Alexis.

1665 Shabbethai Zebi (1626-76) publicly accepted as the Messiah at Smyrna.

1667 (Feb. 14) Jews run races at the Roman carnival for the last time.

1670 Jews banished from Vienna and Lower Austria by Emperor Leopold I. Synod of Lithuanian rabbis and deputies settle spheres of jurisdiction in relation to central kahals.

1671 Frederick William, the Great Elector, grants a privilege for twenty years to fifty families driven from Austria.

1678 Appearance of the pseudo-Messiah Mordecai Moshiah of Eisenstadt.

1680 (June 30) Auto da fe at Madrid.

1682 (May 10) Auto da fe at Lisbon.

1686 Jews the victims of the Imperialist soldiery at the recapture of Buda from Turks.

1690 Ninety Jews from Curacao settle at Newport, R. I.

1695 Jews forbidden to enter Sweden by Charles IX.

1700 The house of Oppenheimer in Vienna attacked by a mob. Eisenmenger attempts to publish his *"Entdecktes Judenthum."*

1703 Jonas Aaron settles in Philadelphia.

1710 The *"Judenordnung"* of Hamburg determines the social condition of the Jews of that city.

1716 (July 24-25) Serious uprising against the Jews at storming of Posen.

1727 (April 26) Jews expelled from Russia and the Ukraine by Catharine. (Nov. 15) Act passed by General Assembly of New York permitting Jews to omit "on the faith of a Christian" from oath of abjuration.

1732 (Sept. 2) *"Editto sopra gli Ebrei"* of Clement III renews all restrictions against Jews of Rome.

1733 (July) Forty Jews from Lisbon arrive at Savannah, Ga.

C.E.

1738 (Feb. 4) Joseph Suss Oppenheimer executed at Vienna.

1740 (Feb. 3) Charles the Bourbon, King of Naples and of the two Sicilies, invites the Jews back for fifty years. (July 11) Jews expelled from Little Russia by Czarina Anne. Act passed by English Parliament naturalizing Jews settled in the American colonies.

1742 (Dec. 2) Jews expelled from Great Russia by Czarina Elizabeth.

1744 (Dec. 18) Expulsion of Jews from Bohemia and Moravia.

1747 Bull of Benedict XIV decides that a Jewish child baptized, even against canonical law, must be brought up under Christian influences.

1748 Jews permitted to remain in Bohemia on payment of a "Judensteuer" of 216,000 florins.

1750 (April 17) Frederick the Great issues a *"Generalprivilegium"* for the Prussian Jews.

1753 Act passed by English Parliament permitting Jews to be naturalized. "No Jews, no wooden shoes" riots in England.

1754 Act granting naturalization to English Jews repealed.

1756 Blood accusation in Jampol, Poland.

1757 Jacob Frank becomes leader of the Shabbethaians. Bishop of Kamenitz-Podolsk orders Talmuds to be burned.

1761 Persecution of Jews in Yemen.

1767 (June 20) Cossacks slay thousands of Jews at Homel.

1772 Jews settle in Stockholm, Karlskrona, and Gothenburg, by favor of Gustavus III.

1776 (Oct. 17) Senatorial decree of Russia grants freedom of settlement and other rights to baptized Jews.

1781 Joseph II of Austria abolishes the Jewish poll-tax, and grants civil liberties to the Jews.

1782 Joseph II issues his Toleration Edict.

1787 Frederick William II removes the "Leibzoll" in Prussia.

1790 The French National Assembly grants citizenship to the Sephardic Jews of Bordeaux. New constitution for Jews of Silesia; a few receive general privileges, etc.

1791 The French National Assembly grants full civil rights to the Jews.

1796 Jews of Holland declared by the National Assembly to be full citizens of the Batavian Republic.

1797 (Aug. 1) Two Jews, Bromet and De Lemon, elected members of the second National Assembly of Holland.

1801 "Leibzoll" removed in Nassau.

1803 Israel Jacobson and Wolff Breidenbach agitate the abolition of the poll-tax for Jews in Germany.

(To be Continued)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NATIONAL WEEKLY

Social Justice

Founded 1936 by Father Coughlin

The Catholic Smear

THE REVEREND EDMUND A. WALSH, S.J., is Vice-President of Georgetown University. Speaking before 3,000 Catholic war veterans at St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York, he affirmed that "impartial history will record that it was in Moscow that the disintegration of modern Europe was first plotted, planned and organized."

It is a relief to learn from such an authoritative source as is Father Walsh that Communism at least preceded Naziism.

It is treacherous during these diplomatic days to speak the unadorned truth. Not so with the eminent Jesuit who, throughout his career, has been a veritable John the Baptist destined, we suppose, to lose his physical head at the price of saving his spiritual helmet.

Father Walsh in his speech demanded "an end to the whispering campaign in certain quarters . . . that the Catholic Church, because it opposes Communism, is consequently a secret friend of Naziism and Fascism."

It is true that Catholics have been victimized by this cowardly canard. It was so in the case of Father Coughlin who asked religious Jews to join with him in combatting Communism.

It will be so with every Catholic who possesses the spiritual fortitude to speak the unadorned truth that Communism is the greatest evil menacing the world today; that decent people cannot co-operate with Communism in any enterprise whatsoever.

Of old, Christ was calumniated as being no friend of Caesar's. In later days, Bishop John Fisher was decapitated for preferring to serve God rather than Caesar in a matter which concerned an intrinsic evil.

The folly of it all is that we Catholics are Americans who detest both Communism and Naziism -- Americans of such a calibre that we prefer to die rather than submit to an illegal change in our *Constitution* and our way of life by trading our Americanism for the fleshpots of Moscow.

Why must we become partisans in this current war whose contestants are either imperialists or Marxists?

Have we not long since disavowed imperialism, sealing our disavowal with the blood of the patriots who died at Lexington and Concord?

Have we not long since disavowed Marxism, confirming our disavowal by the *Constitution of the United States* and the *Bill of Rights* which guarantees freedom of religion, of conscience, of press and the right to hold property independent of any incursion on the part of majorities?

The error of the present day is that Americans have ceased being Americans in that they have seemingly wedded their destiny and their very existence to an impotent capital resident in London and to an immoral ideology stemming from Moscow.

The pioneering spirit of our forebears has been cashiered by timid, cowardly politicians.

Of old -- without navy, a well-equipped army, gold or a plenitude of materials -- our forebears dared stand against the embattled might of grasping Albion. Their spirit conquered!

Today, though we be the wealthiest nation in the world; though we are protected by the best possible armaments in the world, we cringe and crawl before the British Lion, having lost the spirit of the pioneers.

No; we are not Nazis, Fascists. We are Americans. But we accuse these compromisers and foreign entanglers of being defeatists -- men who have lost faith in their *Constitution*; men who have lost hope in their countrymen; men who have lost love for the *Stars and Stripes*.

At them we point the finger of scorn when, from subversive quarters, they originate an attack against Catholics as being pro-Nazi or pro-Fascist.

Social Justice States Its Stand Against All-Out Aid to U.S.S.R.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED